



United States
Department of
Agriculture



Cooperative State,
Research, Education,
and Extension Service

Monday, June 8, 2009

TO: Chandra Reddy, Director
Tim Cross, Director
William Brown, Director

FROM: Bart Hewitt, Accountability and Reporting Leader /s/
Office of Planning and Accountability

SUBJECT: FY 2010-2014 Plan of Work Update Review

The Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service has reviewed the Fiscal Year 2010-2014 University of Tennessee Research and Extension and Tennessee State University Extension Combined Plan of Work Update as required under the Agricultural, Research, Extension and Education Reform Act of 1998. The Plan of Work Update (POW) is accepted. We appreciate your efforts in submitting the POW, which we will use in support of the planning, leadership, and evaluation of CSREES programs.

The review of your POW was completed by your CSREES State liaisons Etta Saltos and Greg Crosby, National Program Leaders, and the Office of Planning and Accountability. The review was based on the criteria published in the Federal Register notice dated January 25, 2006, with additional guidance and on-line training on the POW published on the CSREES AREERA Plan of Work Website (<http://www.csrees.usda.gov/business/reporting/planrept/plansofwork.html>), and the “2009-2013 Plan of Work Review Checklist and Review Summary” you received last year.

The “2010-2014 Plan of Work Review Checklist and Review Summary” from the National Program Leaders who reviewed your POW is attached. We hope you find these comments useful and suggest you read them carefully for recommendations and requirements needed to help you in preparing your FY 2011-2015 Plan of Work Update, which will come due by April 1, 2010.

You will receive a separate communication from the Office of Extramural Programs, Funds Management Branch, concerning any requirement for the submission of the Multistate Extension and Integrated Research and Extension funds, sections 105 and 204 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998.

We appreciate you working with us to improve our reporting and accountability system as we continue to improve the web-based Plan of Work and Annual Report as part of the overall Research, Education and Extension Reporting System (REEport), formerly the “One Solution” initiative.

If you have questions following your review of our comments, please contact Bart Hewitt, Accountability and Reporting Leader, by E-mail at bhewitt@csrees.usda.gov, or by phone at 202-720-0747.

Attachment

cc: CSREES Office of Extramural Programs
CSREES State Reviewers

2010 University of Tennessee Research and Extension and Tennessee State
University Extension Combined Plan of Work Review

Status: Submitted
Date Submitted: 06/06/09

2010 University of Tennessee Research and Extension and Tennessee State University Extension Combined Plan of Work Review

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:

- Etta Saltos
- Greg Crosby

Plan 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 plan

Comments:

The Executive Summary provides a good overview of the planned programs.

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:

An excellent description of the merit review process is provided.

Evaluation of the Success of Multi and Joint Activities Section (Required):

Acceptable		
YES	NO	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1) How will the planned programs address the critical issues of strategic importance, including those identified by the stakeholders?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2) How will the planned programs address the needs of under-served and under-represented populations of the State(s)?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3) How will the planned programs describe the expected outcomes and impacts? and
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(4) How will the planned programs result in improved program effectiveness and/or efficiency?

Comments:

Clear descriptions of the requested information are provided. Many of the critical issues identified parallel those identified at the national level, e.g. childhood obesity, family economics, organic agriculture.

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:

This section is extremely well written. Examples of how stakeholder input have been used (e.g., addition of parenting education to the Human Development program) are provided.

Planned Programs Section (Required):

Acceptable		
YES	NO	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Uses Appropriate Logic Model Elements
<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:

Generally, the descriptions of planned programs are well written. There are still some programs, e.g. Youth Development, Family Economics that reference a single Knowledge Area and could cross reference others.

General Recommendations:

Overall this is an excellent plan. There are still a few areas that could expand the number of Knowledge Areas referenced.

We hereby recommend CSREES acceptance of this Plan of Work.

Etta Saltos /s/

06/06/2009

NPL Signature

Date

Greg Crosby /s/

06/06/2009

NPL Signature

Date