

Preface

Purpose

The purpose of a program review is to guide program development on a continual basis. A program review is a process that evaluates the status, effectiveness, and progress of programs and helps identify future direction and priorities. Program reviews are a standard practice in higher education (Barak, 1082; Barak & Berdahl, 1978; Berrett, D., 2011). The Ohio State University Extension Family and Consumer Sciences program review is a voluntary practice for self-study and external review.

The Review Includes Five Elements

- The State of Family and Consumer Sciences in Ohio
- Ohio State University Extension Family and Consumer Sciences Internal Self-Study
- Ohio State University Extension Crowdsourcing Insight Summary: Family and Consumer Sciences
- External committee visits and final report
- Key stakeholder communication throughout the process

Context

Ohio State University Extension embarked upon a multi-year effort to build the Extension organization of the future. That journey began with the *Vice President's Conversation on the Future of Extension*. The overall goal of that effort was to ensure that OSU Extension remains relevant and responsive to the needs of Ohioans well into the future.

Data gathered through the *Vice President's Conversation* was used as a foundation for a designEXT effort to put ideas into action. One of the designEXT steps includes partnering with individuals and communities to co-create multi-faceted solutions for current and emerging issues.

The *OSU Extension Family and Consumer Sciences Program Review* is one of a series of OSU Extension program reviews.

ONE Thing

Our land-grant mission –

OSU Extension delivers knowledge from Ohio State to every county in Ohio, and we work **WITH** people right where they live to strengthen their own lives and communities.

*(excerpt from OSU Extension Interim Director Update,
Jackie Kirby Wilkins – August 2019)*

Contact

Ohio State University Extension program reviews are conducted on behalf of Dr. Jackie Wilkins, interim director of OSU Extension and associate dean, College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences. Program reviews are led by Dr. Greg Davis, with support from Terri Fisher.

<https://extension.osu.edu/strategic-initiatives/ohio-family-and-consumer-sciences-fcs-program-review>

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| I. Introduction | 4 |
| A. Purpose | 4 |
| B. Methods..... | 4 |
| C. Summary of Findings..... | 5 |
| II. Question 1 – If you could transform the Family and Consumer Sciences program, what would you suggest? | 5 |
| A. Primary Themes | 5 |
| B. Secondary Themes..... | 8 |
| III. Question 2 – What can Family and Consumer Sciences do to be more responsive to needs and issues of Ohioans?..... | 9 |
| A. Primary Themes | 9 |
| B. Secondary Themes..... | 11 |
| IV. Conclusion..... | 12 |
| V. References | 13 |

Contributors

Teresa McCoy, Amy Elhadi, and Debby Lewis

Editor

Michelle Gaston

*For the purpose of this report, the Ohio State University Extension
Family and Consumer Sciences program may be referred to simply as FCS.*

I. Introduction

A. Purpose

One of Ohio State University Extension's four program areas is family and consumer sciences (FCS). OSU Extension's family and consumer sciences program serves thousands of people throughout Ohio every year. FCS professionals deliver the highest quality, research-based educational programs focused on building healthy people, healthy finances and healthy relationships. They help people keep healthy through good nutrition and food safety, use their money wisely, and balance the demands of life and work.

This crowdsourcing insight summary is part of the FCS program review that evaluates the status, effectiveness, and progress of programs and helps identify future direction and priorities.

B. Methods

The OSU Extension Learning and Organizational Development (LOD) unit administered a crowdsourcing two-question survey. Crowdsourcing is an effective and powerful practice of obtaining needed services, ideas, or content by soliciting contributions from a large group of geographically dispersed people (Doan, Ramakrishnan, & Halevy, 2011; Estellés-Arolas & González-Ladrón-De-Guevara, 2012; Merriam-Webster, 2014; Raison, Fox & D'Adamo-Damery, 2014).

In November 2019, a two-question survey invitation was sent via email to 986 OSU Extension personnel included on the "ALL-Extension" listserv and employees in The Ohio State University College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences Human Resources database who have an Extension appointment. Two follow-up reminders were sent to non-respondents. All Extension personnel were included in this inquiry to gain insight from interdisciplinary perspectives. There were 266 respondents for a response rate of 27 percent.

Two evaluators on the OSU Extension Learning and Organizational Development team analyzed the survey data using NVivo 12 software. After reading through the transcriptions, the codebook was created by one evaluator and then verified by the second evaluator. Then the two evaluators collaboratively reviewed the coding system for validity. The transcriptions were coded independently, and then the files were combined for the final analysis.

During the analysis process, themes that participants mentioned more often and across most of the participants were identified as "Primary Themes" and themes that were mentioned in some responses were identified as "Secondary Themes." Some themes were identified but rarely mentioned, so were not included in the report. This report will highlight the findings of the two survey questions.

C. Summary of Findings

Two open-ended questions prompted responses with primary and secondary themes.

Question 1. Based on what you know you know about the full program area of OSU Extension Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) (Healthy People, Finances, Relationships and SNAP-Ed/EFNEP), what one to three things would you suggest to transform FCS in any way you wish?

Primary Themes: Operations, Programming, Partnerships and Collaboration

Secondary Theme: Community and Advertising, FCS Culture/Characteristics, Responding to Needs

Question 2. What can Family and Consumer Sciences do to be more responsive to current and emerging needs and issues of Ohioans?

Primary Themes: Programming, Operations, Responding to Needs

Secondary Themes: Partnerships and Collaborations, Assessment and Evaluation

From the qualitative analysis of the crowdsourcing information, there was overlap in some of the themes identified in the responses to the two questions.

II. Question 1. Based on what you know you know about the full program area of OSU Extension Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) (Healthy People, Finances, Relationships and SNAP-Ed/EFNEP), what one to three things would you suggest to transform FCS in any way you wish?

A. Primary Themes

1. Operations: In this theme, participants shared their opinions and suggestions regarding issues related to how the program operates as a whole rather than on a specific county or office. Codes included accountability and consistency, compensation and pay, leadership, financial resources, and human resources.

- a) **Accountability and Consistency:** Participants expressed their desires for clarification of supervisors' roles and better supervision of SNAP-Ed and EFNEP and the need for integration of FCS, SNAP-Ed, and EFNEP.

Examples:

"More direction from state leaders—more accountability."

"Clarify the supervisor role to SNAP-Ed/EFNEP program assistants."

"Make regional supervision more like EFNEP. They help us to connect to communities and county governments better than most."

"Create a system to better integrate the SNAP Ed/EFNEP program into all aspects of Extension. It can feel at times that they are separate entities."

- b) **Compensation and Pay:** In this theme, concern was expressed about the low salary levels for both SNAP-Ed and EFNEP program assistants and coordinators and for FCS educators in general.

Examples:

“Raise salaries for SNAP-Ed/EFNEP program assistants and program coordinators to lower turnover, which is hard on programming and communities.”

“Pay FCS workers more to retain quality staff.”

“Better pay for specialists and programming support staff.”

- c) **Leadership:** Participants believed that leadership should be visionary, provide strong and clear programmatic direction, and support staff in innovative and responsive programming.

Examples:

“Establish a working goal for each of the healthy areas with leadership from the top.”

“New leadership that provides a vision, direction, and support for staff.”

“Additional leadership and help to counties.”

“Listen.”

- d) **Financial Resources:** Participants want to see increased funding for SNAP-Ed and that the grant would allow for more flexibility in covering expenses.

Examples:

“Break out of the current funding trap so that FCS becomes a viable outreach option for ALL FAMILIES.”

“Provide access to seed funding to test new program ideas.”

“Adjust the steadfast restrictions on the SNAP-Ed program.”

“Additional easy-to-access budgeting tools and guidelines.”

- e) **Human Resources:** Almost all participants stated the need to have an FCS educator in every county in Ohio. An FCS educator in every county would allow OSU Extension to meet community needs through increased program offerings. The need for diversity in staff was also recognized.

“More full-time FCS educators; one in each county.”

“Need program people in every county.”

“SNAP-Ed needs more workforce, better conditions.”

“Increased diversity of staff.”

“I wish there were more training on curriculum for new educators.”

“Provide strong support for FCS educators for professional development opportunities.”

2. Programming: In this area, participants were concerned about the type of programs offered to Ohioans. Overall, there were not any suggestions for stopping programs, but one person did comment that all program areas need to “find a good mechanism to let low-impact programs, which might be cherished by clientele, end to create capacity for new programs that could be more impactful.” Some of the codes in this area included the following.

- a) **Continuation of Programs:** Participants expressed a lot of support for personal finance and budgeting programs and those programs dealing with nutrition and healthy eating, healthy lifestyles, and food safety and food preservation. Other program areas that were mentioned included mental health, healthy relationships for families, parenting, and food insecurity.

Examples:

“Offer more programming on personal finances.”

“Emphasis on family budgeting in regards to heavy debt.”

“More staff, programming, and emphasis on all FCS topics, especially money and finances and family relationships.”

“Food preservation/food safety expertise for all counties.”

“Continue to provide the much needed programs, such as ‘Dining with Diabetes’.”

“Healthy relationships for marriages and families.”

“Have more parenting programs.”

- b) **Adding New Programs:** In this code, participants mentioned a variety of topics they wanted to see. In addition, they addressed new ways programs could be designed and delivered.

Examples:

“Climate change impacts on communities and families.”

“Help consumer use less plastic.”

“Implement more environmental and systems changes in the community.”

“FCS should have a food show reaching all citizens in Ohio!”

“Tasty videos—cooking and food videos online are ALL the rage and we should really monopolize on this popularity within FCS ... where are we? We are so behind the curve!”

“Partner with state of Ohio school districts to bring 4-H into the classroom more.”

“Encourage college visits to youth (give the youth college experiences).”

“Connect 4-H youth with 4-H resources when they enter college.”

3. Partnerships and Collaboration: Participants shared ideas about the partnership between FCS SNAP-ED, and EFNEP and with other program areas. In addition, the need for

partnerships and collaborations with schools, banks, food retailers, community-based health care workers, nonprofits, and other agencies and organizations was mentioned repeatedly.

Examples:

“More partnerships between SNAP-Ed, FCS, and EFNEP.”

“More programs to work on across 4-H, Agriculture, and FCS.”

“Increase cross-over programming with ANR, CD, and 4-H.”

“Need to improve connections with local leaders.”

“Engage with community health workers.”

B. Secondary Themes

1. Community and Advertising: This theme captures a spectrum of responses about promoting the FCS program externally, communicating with other educators in the system, and the use of various communication methods, including social media, television, radio, and newspapers. Participants expressed the need for FCS to be visible, better understood in terms of programs offered, and improved communication internally.

Examples:

“Clearer communication to the general public about what FCS offers ...”

“Develop a standard marketing process.”

“Be able to use more technology and social media to share information about their programs.”

“We need to market ourselves to millennials and Gen Z. The idea of home ec is appealing to certain generations but seems antiquated to younger generations.”

“More coordinated media communications at the OSU level instead of leaving it to the counties.”

2. FCS Culture/Characteristics: Various general comments about FCS make up this theme concerning relationships, identity, and systems.

Examples:

“Create a system to better integrate the SNAP-Ed/EFNEP program into all aspects of Extension. It can feel at times they are separate entities.”

“Recognize EFNEP and SNAP-Ed accomplishments within the overall Extension system.”

“FCS as a program area seems to have been absorbed into SNAP-Ed/EFNEP.”

“Change the name FCS. Most don’t understand what it means or what we can offer.”

“Rebrand FCS – be more relevant in the community and state.”

“FCS needs to find a way to separate themselves from all the other organizations that are perceivably doing the same things.”

3. Responding to Needs: Participants emphasized the importance of reaching out to diverse and under-served populations. Themes within this code included youth, older adults, families, urban audiences, and diversity and inclusion.

Examples:

“I think we need to offer programs for teens to help them plan for the future. So many kids have no one at home to give them advice on planning for the future.”

“Have more programs for seniors and caregivers.”

“Have more parenting programs.”

“More outreach in our urban communities.”

“Work at going out of our comfort zone—especially with the LGBTQ community.”

“Prioritize serving disadvantaged populations (poor, communities of color, disabilities, etc.).”

4. Evaluation: Participants stressed the need to stay relevant, show program impact, and establishing priorities.

Examples:

“Continue efforts to stay relevant and show impact in our communities. Eliminate low-impact programs.”

“Use collective impact instead of working in our own silo.”

“Use results-based accountability to measure population level changes and our program’s performance measures.”

III. Question 2. What can Family and Consumer Sciences do to be more responsive to current and emerging needs and issues of Ohioans?

A. Primary Themes

1. Programming: In this area, participants talked about continuation of programs offered to Ohioans and ideas for new programs.

- a) **Continuation of Programs:** Participants expressed a need for programs related to food, such as nutrition and healthy eating, healthy lifestyles, mental health (including the opioid crisis), finance and budgeting, and parenting classes.

Examples:

“Provide science-based nutritional information.”

“Helping to address food insecurity in rural areas.”

“Focus on ways families can shop on a budget.”

“Parenting classes for those who are starting out ...”

“Increased involvement across the state in addictive issues relevant to each county’s needs due to its impact on relationships, finances, parenting, and nutrition.”

- b) **Adding New Programs:** In this code, participants mentioned a variety of topics that could be addressed by FCS.

Examples:

“The funding is in workforce development ... This is an area where Extension could be very competitive through soft-skill education.”

“Immunization education programs.”

“FCS needs to find out what the younger generations might be lacking (e.g., life skills) that are no longer offered in high school or other places and tap into those needs.”

“Family mental health.”

“Address mental health issues in small counties.”

“Student loan debt education or prevention are big issues.”

- c) **Program Concerns:** This theme included items related to program tools and resources, program quality assurance, and Extension specialist support for programs.

Examples:

“For counties that do not have an FCS person, state contact people need to be identified.”

“Continue with great curriculum/program development that is structured and repeatable.”

“Greatly improve the turnaround time on responding to local crises and issues.”

“More sharing of emerging issues/research from state/field specialists to educators. It is difficult for county staff to keep up with this and do all their other jobs.”

2. Operations: In this theme, participants shared their opinions and suggestions regarding issues related to how the program operates as a whole rather than on a specific county or office. Codes included human resources, funding, and leadership.

Examples:

“Have an FCS educator in every county.”

“Have more educators across the state.”

“Administration can invest in 1) a more diverse workforce and 2) a diversity/equity/inclusion and community engagement field specialist position ...”

“Support, with resources, FCS at the local level to respond to and fulfill community needs beyond just community nutrition.”

“Cultivate visionary, proactive leadership.”

“It is great to see how their leadership delivers developed and complete programs and materials and directions to this program.”

3. Responding to Needs: Participants emphasized the importance of being responsive to community and participant needs through awareness and engagement. Themes within this code included youth, older adults, families, urban audiences, and diversity and inclusion.

Examples:

“Be more aware of what it is like to live in an urban. Greater support of aging issues and of early childhood.”

“Follow the trends seen in youth and adult generations to adjust the program needs.”

“We need to address how to deal with diversity and everyone’s rights.”

“Look at diverse families and not just white families—culturally relevant research.”

B. Secondary Themes

1. Partnerships and Collaboration: Respondents discussed a myriad of partnerships important to FCS, including other government agencies, schools, businesses, faith organizations, and advisory councils/committees.

Examples:

“Continue to assume leadership roles within local and regional and civic organizations to assist in implementing quality of life initiatives keeping with statewide FCS initiatives.”

“Work with the Department of Job and Family Services in order to be aware of our community needs.”

“Be more involved in local community action groups.”

“Think beyond Ohio (State University) Extension to develop relationships and learn from other university programs, states, and international organizations.”

“Utilize advisory boards/committees.”

2. Assessment and Evaluation: This theme covers codes about assessing needs of populations being served and evaluating effectiveness of FCS programs. Participants discussed their wishes to be relevant in their communities by meeting clientele needs based on current issues and by demonstrating impact.

Examples:

“Statewide recognizable programming offered locally to meet the county needs.”

“Staying current with the problems families face today.”

“Think outside the box and reassess population needs on a regular basis.”

“Continue to reach out to other stakeholder groups within their communities for input.”

“Reevaluate all programs for relevance and discontinue those that no longer provide impact.”

IV. Conclusion

The qualitative analysis of the crowdsourcing information leads to the following conclusions.

Participants in the crowdsourcing believe that FCS programs are relevant and need to be continued. Particular program areas that were mentioned include personal finance and budgeting, nutrition and healthy eating, healthy lifestyles, food safety and food preservation, mental health, healthy relationships for families, parenting, and food insecurity. There were suggestions for new program ideas; yet, there were NOT suggestions for particular programs that should be eliminated.

There is a strong desire to meet community needs and deliver programs that are relevant to today’s audiences. In addition, respondents want the FCS faculty and staff to reflect the diversity of the communities in which they work.

Participants recommended that leadership should be visionary, provide strong and clear programmatic direction and support staff in innovative and responsive programming. Concern was expressed about the integration of FCS, SNAP-Ed, EFNEP as those components come together to form a comprehensive Extension program.

Respondents expressed overwhelmingly the need for additional FCS educators to provide continued and needed programming in the state. They also realize that partnerships and collaborations are necessary to the success of FCS programs and community engagement.

The need to both honor the FCS past while moving toward the future was a common theme. Participants believe there is a need to explain and rebrand FCS.

V. References

- Barak, R. J., & Berdahl, R. O. (1978). State-Level Academic Program Review in Higher Education. Report No. 107.
- Berrett, D. (2011). Program Reviews Can Produce “Death Spirals” or Happy Endings. (Cover story). *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 58(3), A1–A12.
- Doan, A., Ramakrishnan, R., & Halevy, A. Y. (2011). Crowdsourcing systems on the world-wide web. *Communications of the ACM*, 54(4), 86-96.
- Estellés-Arolas, E., & González-Ladrón-De-Guevara, F. (2012). Towards an integrated crowdsourcing definition. *Journal of Information science*, 38(2), 189-200.
- Merriam-Webster (2014). Online dictionary. Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/crowdsourcing>
- Raison, B., Fox, J. M., & D'Adamo-Damery, P. (2014). Crowdsourcing eXtension: Communities of Practice provide rapid response. *Journal of Extension*, 52(6).
- U.S. Department of Agriculture Office of Inspector General (2014). Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan. Retrieved from <https://www.usda.gov/oig/webdocs/DIStratPlanFY14-FY18.pdf>