Total Actual Amount of professional FTEs/SYs for this State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year: 2018</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Merit Review Process

1. The Merit Review Process that was Employed for this year
   - Combined External and Internal University Panel
   - Combined External and Internal University External Non-University Panel
   - Expert Peer Review

2. Brief Explanation

   The Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station (AFES) uses the scientific peer review process to review and evaluate proposals, publications and specific annual reports that include the annual narratives required to report activities related to the Plan of Work. Extension uses the merit review process and the general review process for this joint annual report and Plan of Work. AFES complies with sections 3(c)(1) and (2) of the Hatch Act and section 1445 of NARETPA (Hatch Regular Capacity Funds) and the amendment to the Hatch Act of 1887 to Section 104 by AREERA for programs funded under section 3(c)(3) of the Hatch Act (Hatch Multistate Research Funds) by using its established scientific review process for all proposals, publications and specific annual reports.

   All new and revised Hatch (and McIntire-Stennis) project proposals undergo scientific peer review. The blind peer review panel is composed of a minimum of three members and consists of competent authorities in the discipline of the proposal/publication/annual report or related disciplines. Each reviewer completes a Peer Review Form that includes specific criteria, provides for other comments and suggestions, and makes a recommendation to the director. Reviews are returned to the author(s) for revision if needed. The director reviews all comments and recommendations from the reviewers, along with the revised proposal/publication/report. Scientific peer review of multistate research projects are carried out for individual projects under the aegis of the Multistate Review Committee (MRC- formerly RCIC). The director of research is a member of the MRC. All faculty who are participants in Hatch multistate projects are required to have an approved Hatch general project that is related to the field of study of the multistate project.

   SNRE has an evaluation specialist who helps design outcome and impact evaluations, working with faculty to evaluate individual programs. Various program partners sometimes provide survey instruments or facilitate data collection as well. In FY18, outreach faculty were again required to include hours dedicated to evaluation in their workloads. Feedback is gathered for many workshops and all conferences.
III. Stakeholder Input

1. Actions taken to seek stakeholder input that encouraged their participation

- 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 groups
- Survey specifically with non-traditional individuals
- Survey of selected individuals from the general public
- Other (SNRE Website, Newsletter & Blog, Facebook pages, Twitter feeds, YouTube channels and interactive citizen science based smartphone applications)

Brief explanation.

AFES is in the process of reestablishing an advisory council drawn from agriculture, natural resources, forestry, mine engineering and economic development. SNRE interacts with regional audiences around the state in both formal and informal settings each year. Examples of these include:

- Alaska Livestock Producers
- Alaska Food Policy Council
- Alaska Peony Growers Association
- Alaska Produce and Greenhouse Growers
- Delta Farm Forum
- Delta Harvest Wrap-Up
- Kawerak Native Association
- On-demand meetings at the request of stakeholders
- Regional and Statewide Farm Bureaus
- Reindeer Owners and Breeders Association

State stakeholders include:

- AHTNA Native Corporation
- Afognak Native Corporation
- Alaska Natural Fiber Business Association
- Chena Hot Springs Resort
- Department of Environmental Conservation
- Department of Natural Resources
- Diversified Livestock Association
- Division of Agriculture
- Division of Forestry
- Fairbanks Economic Development Corporation
• Fairbanks North Star Borough
• Farmers markets around the state
• Matanuska-Susitna Borough
• North Slope Borough
• Pike’s Waterfront Hotel & Greenhouse
• School districts around the state

Since much of Alaska land is under federal and state agency control, natural resource stakeholders include government land managers. Federal stakeholders for SNRE include:

• Bureau of Indian Affairs
• Bureau of Land Management
• National Park Service
• U.S. Fish and Wildlife
• U.S. Geological Survey
• USDA/NRCS, ARS, Forest Service

2(A). A brief statement of the process that was 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.

Stakeholders include individuals and groups who would logically benefit from Extension's services. Other stakeholders are partner agencies organizations and related stakeholder organizations. Examples include the Farm Bureau, Grange and Farmers Union, as well as Master Gardener associations and food banks. Additional stakeholder groups are Alaska Native tribal organizations, school districts and village governments who request services to help build community educational and development capacity.

A number of stakeholders identify themselves by calling or e-mailing Extension faculty or staff. Individuals and groups have been identified through advisory committees, working with agencies that have similar missions, and work with community, religious and workforce groups and other units of the university. Advisory groups like the 4-H leaders' organization provide stakeholder input.

AFES stakeholders are research collaborators, partners in federal or state agencies who approach us with funding or needs, the public who often call and solicit assistance, graduate and undergraduate students, public schools that connect through reindeer programs or the OneTree program, K-12 teachers, and agriculturalists, forest land owners, entrepreneurs and other end user groups.
2(B). A brief statement of the process that was used by the recipient institution to identify individuals and groups who are 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
- Survey of the general public
- Meeting with invited selected individuals from the general public

Brief explanation.

SNRE relies on stakeholder input from advisory groups, collaborators, federal and state agencies, colleagues, faculty, students and other appropriate constituencies for assistance in establishing priorities and developing program direction. Current major stakeholders include the Fairbanks North Star Borough, Matanuska-Susitna Borough, Reindeer Herders Association, Northern Forest Cooperative, Peony Growers Association, Fairbanks Economic Development Corporation, and industries involved in food, fiber and fuel/energy production.

Feedback from the Georgeson Botanical Garden Society, local community-supported agriculture groups, local restaurants and resorts provide research direction. Other significant stakeholder groups include state and federal and private organizations that have professional and programmatic relationships or direct interest in the unit's programming. Some of Extension's major stakeholder organizations include but are not limited to the Farm Bureau, Grange, Alaska Energy Authority, greenhouse growers, food banks, Boys and Girls Clubs, school districts and research units of the university.

Additional stakeholder groups are Alaska Native tribal organizations and village governments that request services to help build community, educational and development capacity. Input is collected from workshop participants through surveys following conferences, classes and workshops, either immediately through paper and/or guided discussion, or as follow-ups by electronic or mail-in surveys. Input is also collected individually by agents, through needs assessments and through programmatic advisory groups and memberships on relevant partner committees.

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

Brief explanation.

SNRE joint research and outreach planned programs are directly related to the workload plans produced by faculty as well as the direction set by administrative leadership. The AFES plan reflects ideas and advice given by client user groups, students, expert advisors, state and national peers and cooperators, and UAF administration. During the FY18 reporting period, the focus areas
of sustainable energy, local and regional food production and food safety, and the need for adult and youth education and training to fill Alaska job and career demands were addressed. These focus areas were used to set priorities in meeting the needs for knowledge about Alaska and circumpolar resources. Input was considered in the budget process. Capacity funds were used in response to research needs based on the emerging focus areas.

CES and AFES will continue to build on past focus areas of food safety and security, health, climate, energy, youth, families and communities, and economic development by adding emphasis on strengthening SNRE's relevancy, capacity and collaboration in those areas. Agents' planned workloads reflect district community issues. Stakeholder needs will continue to be a driving factor in determining Extension priorities and programming.

Stakeholder input in FY18 continues to support the need for youth outreach in rural Alaska, health and nutrition programming, pest management and programs on biomass and responsible wood burning. Interest in locally raised agricultural animals and food production continues to be high. Agents use stakeholder input to identify programming needs and work to offer programs and information that meet those needs. For example, stakeholder involvement on conference planning committees and input at conferences leads to specific topics and speakers at subsequent conferences.

**Brief Explanation of what you learned from your Stakeholders**

Alaskans continue to desire information necessary to make decisions related to a healthy lifestyle and a healthy economy. Food security, energy, climate change, obesity, chronic health issues and youth development have risen to the forefront as areas of particular importance and are therefore leading to development of research and Extension programming, particularly in subsistence, small farm agriculture and energy use. Interest continues in research on animal reproduction and quality meat production techniques. There is also strong interest in culturally relevant programming, local food production, health and nutrition programming, family finance, budgeting and estate planning, and programs that focus on improving communities and reducing energy consumption.

**IV. Expenditure Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Total Actual Formula dollars Allocated (prepopulated from C-REEMS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith-Lever 3b &amp; 3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No Data Entered)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Totaled Actual dollars from Planned Programs Inputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith-Lever 3b &amp; 3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Matching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual All Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Actual Expended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Amount of Above Actual Formula Dollars Expended which comes from Carryover funds from previous |
### V. Planned Program Table of Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>PROGRAM NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agriculture and Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Natural Resources and Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Healthy Individuals, Families and Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Youth Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sustainable Energy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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