

**USDA-CSREES FY 2005 STATE ANNUAL REPORT
REVIEW TEAM SUMMARY**

State: Tennessee

Institution: University of Tennessee (Research & Extension)
Tennessee State University (Extension)

State Contacts: H. Charles Goan, Interim Dean, UT Extension
Thomas H. Klindt, Interim Dean, UT Agricultural Experiment Station
Clyde E. Chesney, Administrator, TSU Cooperative Extension Program

Type of Report: (Combined 1862 Research, 1862 & 1890 Extension)

NPL Reviewers: Basil R. Eastwood and Liang-Shiou Lin

This Review Team Summary reflects the consensus opinion of the review team members regarding the Annual Report.

The Tennessee Combined Report addresses all five National Goals, is well organized and complete. In many ways, this Report may serve as a model and is greatly strengthened by the history of research and extension working together on the Report.

Strengths of the Impact Statements in the Planned Programs: (Related to important impacts and any other statements that highlight programmatic strength)

There are many strong impact statements in this Report. Their credibility is well supported by good descriptions as to how the impact data were gathered. Again this year there is a good mixture of methods of gathering data including observation, questionnaires, production data, on-farm interviews, auction prices, pre-and post-surveys, survey and collection of hard data, demonstrations, farm visits, sales receipts, Farm Service Agency statistics, follow-up by Extension agents; testimonials and teacher observations. The anatomy of a good impact statement may be seen for Goal 1.4, Key Theme: Fruit/Vegetable Production, Title: Improving Fruit & Vegetable Production and Marketing. The data as well as the method of calculating the impact is described and the statement is believable and shows a strong positive impact on the producers' income. There are other excellent statements such as for Goal 1.6 Key Theme: Small Farm Viability, Title: Meat Goat Management; Goal 2.1 Key Theme: Safe Food Handling; Goal 3.1 Key Theme: Human Nutrition; Goal 3.2 Key Theme: Health Care; Goal 4.1 Key Theme: Integrated Pest Management; Goal 4.2 Key Theme: Land Use (Excellent impact); other Goal 4 Key Themes; and a number of Goal 5 Key Themes.

Weaknesses of the Impact Statements in the Planned Programs:

A few of the impact statements may be criticized for describing potential future impacts such as the Tennessee Agritourism Initiative, Improving Milk Quality and Safety and Mitigating Conflicts Between Forest Management, Coal Mining and Wildlife Conservation; failing to describe how the impacts were derived such as the Soybean Disease Control Program, Controlling bacterial Diseases of Tomato, and Cucurbit Powdery Mildew Control. Continue to strive for measured impacts and develop base data for measuring change brought about by the programs.

Stakeholder Input Process Comments: (make comments on the three requirements on the checklist)

The stakeholder input process in Tennessee is well developed and includes good communication between research and extension and between institutions. Efforts to address the priorities established by stakeholders are direct and immediate and are listed in the Report. Phone interviews were conducted with 1,635 citizens (in 2004?) selected at random in Tennessee. Phone interviews in 2005 with members of the ninety five County Agriculture Committees were used to help establish priorities for Extension programming. Although input from the Divorcing Parents program may be considered as representing an under-served audience, there is no other discussion that we could find concerning special efforts to secure input from the under-served, limited resource and small farmers although this is discussed elsewhere in the Report.

Program Review Process Comments:

The protocol for program review was described in the 2000-2004 Plan of Work and has not changed.

Evaluation of the Success of Multi and Joint Activities Comments:

Multistate and integrated joint activities are thoroughly discussed in the connotation of AREERA requirements for this evaluation. Critical issues and the programs addressing these are listed. Programs addressing the under-served and under-represented through multistate efforts are also discussed. Accomplishments of multistate programs are described, however it would be helpful to have some good impact statements showing how these multi and joint activities have helped the citizens of Tennessee.

Multistate Extension Comments: (If Applicable) (provide comments on Accomplishments, or lack thereof, in spending formula funds)

Multistate Extension activities are discussed along with the Multistate Research and Extension programs and include a broad range of programs that cut across several of the National Goals.

Integrated Research and Extension Comments: (provide comments on Accomplishments, or lack thereof, in spending formula funds)

An overview of 2005 Integrated Research and Extension programs and their accomplishments is provided in the Report. Programs described are again mostly in production agriculture.

Suggested Improvements for Next Year:

This is an excellent Report that could be strengthened further with additional work on securing good data on impacts that will stand the test of the most critical reader. Additional work on delineating the special efforts to secure the input and develop programs for the under-served and under-represented groups in Tennessee is also needed.

Required Improvements for Next Year:

None indicated.