

2011 University of Tennessee Research and Extension and Tennessee State University
Extension Combined Plan of Work Review

Status: Accepted

Date Accepted: 07/14/2010

2011 University of Tennessee Research and Extension and Tennessee State University Extension Combined Plan of Work 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:

- 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 Plan of Work provides an excellent overview of the planned programs and the major issues that University of Tennessee and Tennessee State University face.

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 merit review process using both internal and external evaluation processes is in place and is clearly described in the Plan of Work. NIFA reviewers especially like the out-of-state panel review process.

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:

It is clear from the responses provided that the institutions have identified critical issues important to Tennesseans, that they are taking steps to address needs of under-served populations, they have thought about how they will improve planned programs and measure outcomes and impacts. The swift change to focus on organic production as well as larger farms based on public need is commendable.

Stakeholder Input Process Section (Required):

| Acceptable | | |
|------------|----|--|
| YES | NO | |
| | | |

| 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:

Information has been provided to document how stakeholders are identified and how their input has been collected. Reviewers appreciated the examples of how stakeholder input impacted planned programs (e.g. change in focus of the Tennessee Saves program to meet needs of consumers during the economic downturn) that were included not only in this section but throughout the descriptions of the planned programs.

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:

The descriptions of the planned programs contained all the required elements and for the most part the knowledge areas, outputs and outcomes are appropriate. It appears that in the haste to organize the report around the five NIFA challenge areas that some activities and outcomes were placed in the wrong section, e.g. there is a food safety outcome described under Childhood Obesity that would have been more appropriate in the Food Safety program. However, overall the two institutions have done a good job of describing the planned programs, and responding to the NIFA request to report around the five NIFA program goals.

General Recommendations:

The report was well organized and well-written and continues to improve each year. This is an excellent Plan of Work.

We hereby recommend NIFA acceptance of this Plan of Work.

| | |
|-----------------|------------|
| Etta Saltos /s/ | 07/14/2010 |
| NPL Signature | Date |
| Greg Crosby /s/ | 07/14/2010 |
| NPL Signature | Date |