

2012 University of Tennessee Research and Extension and Tennessee State University
Extension Combined Plan of Work Review

Status: Accepted

Date Accepted: 08/17/2011

2012 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 state is continuing to use Virginia Tech and University of Maryland and other states as external reviewers of the annual accomplishments and plan of work. Reviewers are impressed with the ten-year strategic planning efforts.

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:

It is commendable that the out-of-state review panel found the state's merit review process to be fair, reliable, and consistent with the research base.

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:

Once again, the institutions have identified critical issues important to Tennesseans. The University of Tennessee and Tennessee State University have demonstrated that they are taking steps to address needs of under-served populations and that they have thought about how they will improve planned programs and measure outcomes and impacts. It is hard to determine how "environmental sustainability", other than by the forestry community, is being addressed more generally by the plan.

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:

Very broad stakeholder input is commendable. The ten-year plan "Advancing Tennessee" is exemplary. Good examples were provided of how programs were modified using stakeholder input.

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:

Overall, the plan continues its legacy of high quality programming. All five of the NIFA challenge areas were listed among the planned programs. However, there is no plan of activity under the Climate Change program area in either research or extension. Is there not a role for extension and research in determining and communicating best practices for the adaptation and mitigation of climate information in general, and climate variability more specifically? Reviewers were glad to see four out of the five NIFA challenge areas addressed by this plan of work. We were also pleased to see underserved and resource-limited youth populations as a target for the Science, Engineering and Technology (SET) 4-H and youth development programming in the state. It is not clear why 40% of the Extension effort in the Childhood Obesity program was reported under Knowledge Area 712 (which is related to Food Safety). Knowledge area 724 (Healthy Lifestyles) might be more appropriate for the activities described.

General Recommendations:

Overall, the plan continues its legacy of high quality programming. However, there is no plan of activity under the Climate Change program area in either research or extension. Is there not a role for extension and research in determining and communicating best practices for the adaptation and mitigation of climate information in general, and climate variability more specifically? Glad to see four out of the five NIFA challenge areas addressed by this plan of work. Pleased to see underserved and resource-limited youth populations as a target for the Science, Engineering and Technology (SET) 4-H and youth development programming in the state.

We hereby recommend NIFA acceptance of this Plan of Work.

Etta Saltos /s/

08/15/2011

NPL Signature

Date

Greg Crosby /s/

08/15/2011

NPL Signature

Date