

2014 University of Tennessee Research and Extension and Tennessee State University
Extension Combined Plan of Work Review

Status: Accepted

Date Accepted: 06/04/2013

2014 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:

- Eric Norland

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 an overview of the UT and TSU Extension and UT Research Programs. It describes a strategic planning process that involved both UT and TSU clientele. The contribution of agriculture to the state's economy (\$60 billion) is significant and warrants strong research and extension 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:

The Extension Merit Review process involves both internal and external panels and expert merit review. Planned program proposals were developed by state Extension specialists and reviewed by department heads and program leaders which can accept the program as proposed, reject the proposed planned program, or accept the proposed planned program pending changes. A Research Merit Review process is carried out for Hatch multi-state projects. It is unclear if/how single state (TN) projects are subjected to a merit review. This needs to be addressed in the FY 2015 POW.

REQUIRED FOR FY 2015 - Provide a complete description of how Hatch single-state projects are reviewed for merit.

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:

The description of how multi- and joint activities address the pressing needs related to profitable agriculture; family economics; childhood obesity, living well with chronic conditions and how these programs will meet the needs of under-erved and under-represented populations of Tennessee. The programs, as described, will measure the economic impact of agriculture, increased family savings rates, and changes of attitude and behavior as they relate to childhood obesity.

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:

1. Several actions are undertaken to seek stakeholder input that encourage participation. These include invitations to traditional and non-traditional audiences, selected members of the general public and a survey of attitudes.
 2. Several methods are used to identify individuals and groups from which program data can be collected. The methods include advisory group meetings, focus groups, and key informant interviews. Special emphasis was placed on involving youth and other under-represented audiences.
 3. Several different methods will be used to collect input from stakeholders, including meeting with them, and surveying them to collect input.
 4. The stakeholder input that is received will be used in the budget process, to determine emerging issues, re-direction of extension and research programs and other actions as appropriate.
- Overall, UT Extension and Research and TSU Extension have effective processes to engage stakeholders at several levels and in several different ways. The emphasis on youth in the needs assessment is noteworthy.

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 Plan of Work describes 14 planned programs that cover all of the program areas that Extension and Research are typically involved in. Several questions emerged as the Reviewer studied the Plan of Work. They can be summed up in one question: What are the Research FTE's doing? Many of the planned programs have significant investments of research FTE's with no or few outputs or outcomes from the research efforts. For example:

- Planned Program #3 - There are 21 UT research FTE's on this program, but only 1 of the 8 outcomes is a research outcome (Krawczel). The program description is almost entirely about the extension component.
- Planned Program #5 - There are 28 UT research FTE's and no state-defined research outcome. The

7 outcomes that are listed are all extension outputs.

- Planned Program #6 - There are 35 UT research FTE's and only 6 research outputs. What are the projected outputs of the remaining 29 FTE's?

- Planned Program #8 - 27 UT research FTE's. There is 1 research output measure and 1 outcome measure. What will be accomplished by 27 FTE's?

- Planned Programs 9, 12, and 14 have very little accounting of what the 38, 37, and 75 FTE's, respectively, plan to accomplish (outputs and outcomes)

Overall the report appears to be primarily an extension plan of work with very little research included.

REQUIRED ACTIONS FOR FY 2015:

- Participate in a NIFA-initiated conference call with the reviewer and PARS staff to discuss what the Hatch-supported research is projected to accomplish and how to reflect it in the Plan of Work.

- FY 2015 integrated report needs to be truly integrated. This reviewer was previously assigned to a state that effectively integrated both research and extension in its annual report and POW, and would share an example, if TN and TSU were interested.

General Recommendations:

Overall, the Plan of Work document does a thorough job of describing the UT and TSU extension plans for FY 2014. The UT research plan is lacking in enough information and detail to provide a good picture of what will be done in FY 2014. This will need to be corrected in the FY 2015 POW.

The NIFA reviewer and PARS staff seek to have a conference call to discuss what improvements are needed for the FY 2015 POW so that both partners are "on the same page."

The FY 2014 is accepted as written, with changes required for FY 2105.

We hereby recommend NIFA acceptance of this Plan of Work.

Eric Norland /s/

NPL Signature

05/20/2013

Date