

2018 University of Tennessee and Tennessee State University Combined Research and Extension Annual Report of Accomplishments and Results Review

Status: Accepted

Date Accepted: 08/22/2019

2018 University of Tennessee and Tennessee State University Combined Research and Extension Annual Report of Accomplishments and Results Review

State: Tennessee

Institution(s):

- University of Tennessee
- Tennessee State University

Type of Report (Check all that apply)

- 1862 Research
- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Research
- 1890 Extension
- Tuskegee Research
- Tuskegee Extension

NPL Reviewers:

- Eric Norland

Report Overview Section (Required):

Acceptable		
YES	NO	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Executive summary. (Suggested in Guidance)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Total FTEs are included for each appropriate institution of the Report

Comments:

The Executive Summary provides an overview of the context and setting in which University of Tennessee (UT) and Tennessee State University (TSU) plan and conduct extension and research programs that meet the high priority needs of Tennesseans. The economic impact of these programs is significant and the return on investment is 10:1 (\$10 returned for every \$1 invested). The Extension reporting system (SUPER) is used to collect program, audience, and impact data for agriculture, 4-H Youth Development, family and consumer sciences, and community economic development.

The summary provides several examples of research accomplishments in the agricultural sciences of crop production, entomology, weed management, and climate change impacts on natural resources. TSU has established expertise in sustainable bioenergy over the past year and has a major facility expansion for food safety in final design phase.

THE FTE data shows that UT is down more than 100 FTE's from what was planned. This is a significant shortfall that stakeholders may or may not be aware of.

The summary provides the reader with a good overall understanding of the work of these two institutions and the impacts they are having on the people and economy of Tennessee.

Merit/Program Review Process Section (Required):

Acceptable		
YES	NO	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	At least one process has been checked (including other) (required)

Comments:

UT and TSU - both research and extension - have approaches that have been used at their individual institutions for several years and have proved effective for reviewing programs. UT utilized an external university review panel nine years ago to assess the UT Extension Program. The recommendation at that time, in addition to noting that the Plan of Work was of exceptional quality, was that a strong needs assessment and evaluation process should be continued. UT AgResearch project proposals undergo a review process for scientific and merit review and to ensure alignment with research priorities.

TSU holds an annual faculty retreat to provide an opportunity for focus group members o dedicate time to discuss and evaluate program objectives. Additionally the Associate Deans of the College of Agriculture meet frequently with collaborators, department heads, and administrators to review program and project process, and to head off any issues that may be presenting themselves.

Taken together, both UT and TSU have effective program and merit review processes in place which ensure high quality and high relevance programs are being carried out.

Stakeholder Input Process Section (Required):

Acceptable		
YES	NO	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(a) Actions taken to seek stakeholder input that encourages their participation (Required)

Acceptable		
YES	NO	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(b) Method used to identify groups and individuals (Required)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(c) Method used for collecting stakeholder input (Required)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(d) A statement of how collected input will be considered (Required)

Comments:

ACTIONS TAKEN TO SEEK STAKEHOLDER INPUT - UT and TSU employ several processes to seek stakeholder inputs, including targeted invitations and surveys with both traditional and non-traditional groups. Tennessee Extension Agents placed special emphasis on involving youth and other underrepresented groups in needs assessment activities. Both UT and TSU administrators met with the State Extension Advisory Council at least twice a year to determine high priority needs. TSU encourages faculty to be members of and engaged with industry/trade/commodity groups. UT and TSU faculty engage with a wide range of state and federal agencies to collaborate on programs and gather their program priority input.

PROCESSES USED TO IDENTIFY INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS - All Tennessee Extension Agents receive training on needs assessment strategies and selecting individuals for advisory committees. Those who are asked to serve represent the diverse demographics of Tennessee to ensure that ALL Tennesseans are represented, heard and respected. UT Ag researchers are actively engaged with agriculture and natural resources commodity and industry groups. TSU research does not employ a single defined strategy to identify stakeholders, but rather it focuses on identifying stakeholder who can provide the most useful input.

METHODS FOR COLLECTING STAKEHOLDER INPUT - UT and TSU meet with their stakeholder groups, survey them to get input and meet with the general public (open meetings). In FY 2018 Extension conducted 140 different focus groups and 2779 interviews with key informants. This represents a significant effort to collect stakeholder input and is probably one of the best examples in the country of stakeholder input collection. Many UT and TSU programs have a presence on social media which also serves as an opportunity for users to provide input about their program needs. UT AgResearch centers have advisory groups for each of its centers and provide input to UT AgResearch administrators.

HOW STAKEHOLDER INPUT IS USED - Input is used to inform State Action Agendas that delineate programs, curricula, partners, and resources that will be allocated to the various high priority programs. These plans are then reviewed, adjusted as needed and monitored by Regional Program Leaders. Examples of what was learned from stakeholders in the FY 2018:

- County Level Economic Impact of Agriculture - individual fact sheets were developed for each of Tennessee's 95 counties.
- Dryland soybean farmers were introduced to high water saving potential irrigation lines.
- Tennessee extension agents offered the CDC Diabetes Prevention Program in two counties and will be expanded in FY 2019

Planned Programs Section (Required):

Acceptable		
YES	NO	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Used Appropriate Logic Model Elements
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Input Dollars Expended on Each Planned Program
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Appropriate Knowledge Areas
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Appropriate Outputs for each Program
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Appropriate Outcomes for each Program

Comments:

The Tennessee Combined Research and Extension Annual Report of Accomplishments includes an Executive Summary; Merit Review Process; Stakeholder Identification, Recruitment and Input Processes; and the accomplishments and impacts from 13 Planned Programs during FY 2018. The Planned Programs encompass human health, safety and development; nutrition and food safety; environment and natural resources; and the agricultural sciences (soils, crops, horticulture, livestock, and farm management). UT and TSU are conducting research and extension programs on the most pressing issues that Tennesseans face. These programs are discovering new and relevant knowledge and extending it to stakeholders how can use and benefit from it. There are several Planned Programs in this report that document numerous outcome/impact statements; these include but are not limited to Agronomic Crop Systems, Animal Systems, Economic Infrastructure, and Horticultural Systems. There are some Planned Programs that have no Outcome/Impact statements so it is difficult to determine overall effectiveness of the programs; these include: Family Economics, Food Safety, and Health and Safety. The Research reporting of impacts/outcomes if very fine. This is a very fine Annual Report. While there are some planned programs where expanded reporting of outcomes and impacts is called for, the report, in total is wholly acceptable. It is apparent that considerable effort was made to report the accomplishments of University of Tennessee and Tennessee State University research and extension programs and this reviewer appreciates that effort and has enjoyed reading about the work of your faculty and staff at your institutions.

General Recommendations:

In another year, a decade will have passed since UT has had an external review by peer institutions. Even though there may be little change in program priorities, staff and stakeholders change; issues change and/or evolve, and teaching and program delivery methods may change or need to be changed to keep up with the ways in which adults and youth learn. Balancing the costs vs. benefits is always a consideration, but several years have elapsed since the last review. This reviewer encourages an examination of the planned programs with regard to presence/absence of outcome and impact statements. More effort on extension impact statements, by outcome, would better convey what is being accomplished and what it means to Tennesseans. This is particularly true for the extension component of some programs, including Food Safety; Forestry, Wildlife and Fisheries; Human Development and Sustainable Energy.

We hereby recommend NIFA acceptance of this Annual Report.

Eric Norland /s/

NPL Signature

05/24/2019

Date