

2007 University of Tennessee Research and Extension and Tennessee State University Extension Combined Annual Report Review

2007 University of Tennessee Research and Extension and Tennessee State University Extension Combined Annual Report Review

State: Tennessee
Institutions(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• University of Tennessee• Tennessee State University
Type of Report (Check all that apply) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1862 Research<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1862 Extension<input type="checkbox"/> 1890 Research<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1890 Extension<input type="checkbox"/> Tuskegee Research<input type="checkbox"/> Tuskegee Extension
NPL Reviewers: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Greg Crosby• Etta Saltos

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:

Last year's review found the report to be excellent, and this year's review finds that it continues to hold to the same high standard. One minor question, there seems to be a large increase in the number of 1862 Extension FTE's from planned to actual levels (along with a smaller increase in 1862 Research FTE's and a decrease in 1890 FTE's). This reviewer could not find an explanation for the difference.

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:

A thorough explanation of the process has been included. The new online system sounds like an excellent addition. Other states are struggling in this area -- perhaps you would be willing to share information about your system as a model.

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)
<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:

A detailed description of how stakeholder input is collected and used is included. This section responded to last year's reviewer's question about the participation of extension specialists and agents. You are to be commended in your extra efforts to include west Tennessee in the stakeholder input process.

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:

This reviewer has only one relatively minor comment, that some (but not all) of the outcome statements still are outputs rather than outcomes. In other areas, some statements appear in other sections of the report that ought to be reported as outcomes (e.g., the statement that the Tennessee Saves program results in \$7.72 return on every dollar invested in Extension family economics). The 4-H Youth Development and Human Development Planned Programs report impressive output numbers, but lacks qualitative outcome statements. This means that the Tennessee success stories can not be included in portfolio reviews or cited to Congress when requested. In addition, only one KA is reported as relevant when the Knowledge Areas contain other subject matter that could have been classified. This kind of mono-classification means that 4-H Youth Development and Human Development in Tennessee will not be part of other portfolios in the Agency. Please think about how 4-H Youth Development cross-cuts with other subject matter in Extension. Family Economics Planned Program lacks substantive qualitative outcomes.

General Recommendations:

Overall, this is an excellent annual report, but is lacking qualitative outcome and impact statements within the Planned Program section that support the commendable number of outputs.

We hereby recommend CSREES acceptance of this Annual Report.

Greg Crosby /s/

06/01/2008

NPL Signature

Date

Etta Saltos /s/

06/01/2008

NPL Signature

Date