

2013 University of Tennessee Research and Extension and Tennessee State University
Extension Combined Annual Report of Accomplishments and Results Review

Status: Accepted

Date Accepted: 07/30/2014

2013 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 overview of several facets of the UT&TSU extension and research work in Tennessee: all 95 counties in Tennessee are served by the extension and research programs; the economic impact that UT and TSU have in Tennessee in FY 2013 is estimated to be \$487 million; and the UT and TSU extension professionals made more than 5.5 million direct contacts. In addition to the information about economic development and outreach, this reviewer would have benefited from having a better understanding of the "landscape" in Tennessee: demographics, poverty levels, obesity rates, primary agricultural products and their value, natural resource issues and economic return from forests and other natural resource enterprises, and youth demographics and 4-H participation.

It is important to point out to other readers of this annual report that 0FTE/SY's for TSU research are reported separately in the TSU Research Annual Report.

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 merit review process utilized by UT and TSU includes internal university panels, external panels, and expert peer review. The last external peer review was conducted five years ago and because the institutions' plans of work have not changed significantly since then, there was no out-of-state review panel in 2013. This reviewer suggests that the institutions consider planning another out-of-state review. While the Plan of Work may not have changed significantly, the emergence of new issues and/or the degree of urgency may have changed. Also, an out-of-state review panel, after five years, will most likely bring new reviewers with different perspectives into the review discussions.

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:

Actions taken to seek stakeholder input - In FY 2013 UT and TSU Extension made more than 29 thousand contacts through focus groups and interviews with key informants for needs assessment purposes. UT AgResearch has formed three Regional Advisory Councils to provide input to the research work.

Methods used to identify groups and individuals - All Tennessee extension agents receive instruction in selecting needs assessment strategies and selecting individuals. Advisory committee members include individuals who have and have not utilized extension services. No information provided on how AgResearch identifies groups and individuals.

Methods used for collecting stakeholder input - SUPER tracks Extension's needs assessment efforts across Tennessee. Methods used included focus groups and key informant interviews. No information provided on how AgResearch collects stakeholder input. In #1 above AgResearch mentions three RAC's and that they serve as a forum, but more specifics are needed.

How stakeholder input will be considered - Input is used in budget processes, identification of emerging issues, hiring staff, and priority-setting. Stakeholder feedback was used to modify three programs in FY 2103.

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 outputs, outcomes, and impacts of UT Extension and Research and TSU Extension are well-documented. Across all 15 planned programs, there is evidence of both research and extension outcomes: patents received, research and extension publications produced, knowledge gained, and behaviors changed. There are a few programs and outcomes that are noteworthy for various reasons:

- Animal Systems (Planned Program #3) - outcomes 13 & 15 regarding willingness to change practices to mitigate greenhouse gases were of particular interest to the reviewer.

- Childhood Obesity (planned Program #4) - there were a couple of disconnects for the reviewer: The Planned 1862 Research SY's was shown as 13; the actual was zero - a fairly significant difference. Was the "planned" inaccurate and/or the "actual" in fact zero? However, the number of research publications (p. 74 of 265) was 20. Were they written by Extension educators or researchers? If researchers, this seems inconsistent with the Actual SY's shown as zero.

- Economic Infrastructure and Commerce - several seemingly important and core outcomes for TSU Extension - #1, 2, 3 and 7 (pages 91, 92, 93 and 95-96) showed zero outcomes. This is a note of interest and concern for the reviewer.

Across the programs, there is good involvement and support of extension and participation in Communities of Practices.

General Recommendations:

This report is a significant improvement over the 2012 Report of Accomplishments and Results. There is considerably more data provided which more accurately reflects the impact of the UT Extension and Research Programs and the TSU Extension Program. Whatever you did to improve evaluation, data collection and reporting is noted and appreciated by this reviewer and other funders.

One request for the FY 2014 Report: Stakeholder input - Most of the information provided about stakeholder involvement, identification, and use of input was focused on Extension. The only mention of AgResearch in the stakeholder section was that three Regional Advisory Councils were established. Next year, please include AgResearch stakeholder actions and efforts when answering the four questions about stakeholder input.

It was a pleasure to read about the programs impacts by UT and TSU, and this review extends appreciation and acknowledgement for the hard work that goes into preparing this report. It does get read! Best wishes for a successful and impactful FY 2014.

We hereby recommend NIFA acceptance of this Annual Report.

Eric Norland /s/

NPL Signature

07/28/2014

Date