

2012 University of Tennessee Research and Extension and Tennessee State University
Extension Combined Annual Report of Accomplishments and Results Review

Status: Accepted

Date Accepted: 06/26/2013

2012 University of Tennessee Research and Extension and Tennessee State University Extension Combined Annual Report of
Accomplishments and Results 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:

- Eric Norland

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:

The Executive Summary provides a good summary of the economic impact of the extension programs in TN. A more expansive summary about the entire "landscape" in Tennessee would be helpful to this reviewer. And once written, it may serve more purposes than just the Annual Report, and it could be updated fairly easily. This reviewer would be glad to provide an example or two if interested. Economic return is always of interest to funders and policymakers and is part of the picture, but by itself it doesn't fully represent all that Extension does or accomplishes.

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:

The use of an external review panel focused on program planning and evaluation is noteworthy. This reviewer is not aware of other examples where state Extension has asked Extension peers from other states to review and make comments and recommendations. This is a positive effort and undoubtedly results in better programs and better evaluation and impact reporting.

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) UT and TSU employed several strategies to seek stakeholder input, including targeted invitations to users and non-users, non-traditional groups, and local and state advisory committees. The fact that 25% of the needs assessment contacts were under 18 years of age speaks positively about Extension's commitment to the next generation and recognition that young voices matter. It also sends a positive sign to young people that their opinions and advice are important and that they are an important part of the decision-making processes in Extension.

b) Extension used several methods to identify groups and individuals who could provide important input,

ranging from formal needs assessments to less formal open listening sessions.

c) Several methods were used to actually collect stakeholder input, including meeting with and surveying stakeholders. It is significant and noteworthy that Extension reached out to key informants who were not previously active with Extension (47% of the 1076 key informant interviews).

d) Stakeholder input was used to create individual program plans, to identify volunteer leaders, find locations for Extension programs, and to specifically modify four Extension programs: Row Crops Education Program, Agritourism, Tennessee Farmland Legacy Partnership, and Living with Chronic Conditions. These represent good examples of how important stakeholder input is.

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:

The Planned Program descriptions are generally complete and satisfactory. There are a few questions about some of the programs that are shown below for your consideration.

Planned Program #2: Agronomic Crop Systems - Are the numbers in the table, "Actual amount of FTE/SYs expended this program," correct? There seem to be some wide differences between "plan" and "actual paid professional" in both the extension and research columns for 1862 and 1890. Suggest you review and submit a correction if necessary.

Planned Program #5: Economic Infrastructure and Commerce - Outcome #9: Setting a Realistic Path to a Bioenergy Economy - There is no actual data reported here and minimal qualitative information, even though the "Outcome Type" is "Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure." If no data are available or planned, re-consider if this is an indicator that you want to hold yourselves accountable for.

Planned Program #7: Family Economics - There is very little data here; no quantitative outcome or impact statements for any of the eight Outcome Measures and a 4-line evaluation summary. There are a total of 16 "Actual Paid Professional[s]." This is undoubtedly an important program, but it needs stronger evaluation data (quantitative and qualitative). Recommend the Program Leader contact the NIFA Program Leader, Susan Shockey, to see what and how other states are reporting.

Planned Program #8: Food Safety - There is a significant investment of research FTE/SYs (27.2) in this planned program but very little indication of the outcomes, potential outcomes, or impacts of this investment. NIFA needs more than, for example, "We evaluated a military database with over ten thousand MRE items with various quality deteriorations." A more complete description of the research outputs, outcomes, and impacts IS REQUIRED for the FY 2013 annual report.

Planned Program #10: Global Food Security and Hunger - The data in the tables are confusing/misleading. The 1862 Research Planned FTE/SYs is 110; the Actual Paid Professional is 0.0. The table, "Actual dollars expended in this Program" shows 0.0 Hatch and 0.0 Matching. The Knowledge Area table shows 0% in the Research column. The Reviewer takes this to mean that there are no federal Hatch funds being expended in this planned program.

Planned Program #15 - Climate Change - If all projects have been re-assigned to other Planned Programs,

recommend deleting this Planned Program.

General Recommendations:

The Annual Report for UT Extension and Research and TSU Extension demonstrates a comprehensive Extension program that meets the needs of Tennesseans of all ages, life stages, economic status, and employment across the agriculture.

A couple of overall comments for your consideration:

- There are a lot of output and outcome measures in each of the 15 Planned Programs, and there are a lot of output and outcome measures that have no data or qualitative outcome or impact statements. It is impossible to evaluate all programs and output and outcomes. Thus, the reviewer assumes that there is an overall evaluation plan for the UT and TSU Extension programs that identifies high priority programs for in-depth evaluation, given that all programs cannot be evaluated at the same depth and that all programs are not mature enough to yield outcome data.

- It is, admittedly, easier for Extension to quantify outputs, outcomes, and impacts that it is for Research. However, there is a need to document stronger impacts than what is found in the 2012 report. For those applied research projects that are focused on problems faced by farmers, families, and consumers, it ought to be possible to make some projections about the potential impacts where actual impacts are not known yet. The UT Research component of the annual report needs considerable improvement in the FY 2013 Annual Report.

The report is accepted as submitted.

We hereby recommend NIFA acceptance of this Annual Report.

Eric Norland /s/

NPL Signature

05/13/2013

Date