2007 – 2011 Plan of Work Review Checklist and Review Summary

State: Tennessee

Institutions(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: Greg Crosby

Byron V. Garrett

Acceptable?		Element
		Plan Overview Section
☒ YES	☐ NO	Executive summary. (Suggested in Guidance)
☒ YES	☐ NO	Total FTEs are included for each appropriate institution of the Plan

Comments:

Acceptable?		Merit/Program Review Process Section (Required)
☒ YES	☐ NO	At least one process has been checked (including other) (required)

Comments: This is an impressive system of merit review for State Action Agendas and Hatch Projects.

Acceptable?		Evaluation of the Success of Multi and Joint Activities Section (Required)
☒ YES	☐ NO	(1) How will the planned programs address the critical issues of strategic importance, including those identified by the stakeholders?
☒ YES	☐ NO	(2) How will the planned programs address the needs of under-served and under-represented populations of the State(s)?
☒ YES	☐ NO	(3) How will the planned programs describe the expected outcomes and impacts? and
☒ YES	☐ NO	(4) How will the planned programs result in improved program effectiveness and/or efficiency?

Comments:

Acceptable?		Stakeholder Input Process Section (Required)
☒ YES	☐ NO	(a) Actions taken to seek stakeholder input that encourages their participation; (Required)
☒ YES	☐ NO	(b) Method used to identify groups and individuals (Required)
☒ YES	☐ NO	(c) Method used for collecting stakeholder input (Required)
☒ YES	☐ NO	(d) A statement of how collected input will be considered(Required)

Comments: Tennessee exhibits a comprehensive system for collecting, analyzing and utilizing stakeholder input from at least five data collections that identified four top priorites: 1) safety, health, and health care

2) food, environment, and ag protection; 3) youth and workforce development; and 4) sustain personal and family financial skills. This information was used to construct the 2006-2011 State Extension Strategic Plan. The stakeholder input for research was not described in detail.

Acceptable?				Planned Programs Section (Required)
☒	YES	☐	NO	Uses Appropriate Logic Model Elements
☒	YES	☐	NO	Situation and Priorities
☒	YES	☐	NO	Assumptions for the Programs
☒	YES	☐	NO	Ultimate Goal of the Programs
☒	YES	☐	NO	FTEs (Inputs) for each Program
☒	YES	☐	NO	Appropriate Outputs for each Program
☒	YES	☐	NO	Appropriate Outcomes for each Program
☒	YES	☐	NO	External Factors
☒	YES	☐	NO	Evaluation Studies and Methods Indicated (**Optional**)

Comments: Over all, the components of the planned programs are well done. Some specific comments are provided about the number of planned programs, knowledge area (KA) assignments, number of indicators, and quality of research indicators.

When KAs are assigned, we recommend that you assign as many as applicable. For example, the Positive Youth Development Program might include a KA on agricultural production if a substantial part of that program is about showing cattle in 4-H. This way, the outcomes and impacts of Positive Youth Development will show up in portfolios about agricultural production as well as youth development. Thus, strengthening linkages between programs and knowledge areas.

The Animal Systems Program is most compelling and serves as a good illustration of integrated (research/extension) programming. Most of the planned programs exhibit a comprehensive set of indicators. For example, the 35 outcome indicators for Food Safety, Quality, and Nutrition is probably too many from a burden (collection and analysis) point of view.

The research-oriented planned programs on Environmetal and Water Quality Impacts and Biomass Utilization may want to revisit the logic model. These programs in particular offer a rich and profound description of research activities including outputs and outcomes that did not show up in the output and outcomes indicator sections. For example, the Biomass Utilization research program has one outcome indicator that is weak after a strong description of activities such as POLYSYS and invention of technologies. The outcome listed is more of an extension role, rather than research.

General Recommendations: Tennesee might want to consider combining a few of the over 30 planned programs and selecting only essential indicators. Rather than looking for full evidence of accountability, look for indicators of accountability. The research community needs to document outputs and outcomes and associated indicators that are distinct from extension. Those programs that identify only one KA should look for other KA linkages if applicable.

We hereby recommend CSREES acceptance of this Plan of Work.

_____   8/9/2006
           NPL Signature   Date

_____   8/14/2006
           NPL Signature   Date