

2010 University of Tennessee Research and Extension and Tennessee State
University Extension Combined Plan of Work Review

Status: Submitted

Date Submitted: 06/06/09

2010 University of Tennessee Research and Extension and Tennessee State University Extension Combined Plan of Work Review

State: Tennessee

Institutions(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 Executive Summary provides a good overview of the planned 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:

An excellent description of the merit review process is provided.

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:

Clear descriptions of the requested information are provided. Many of the critical issues identified parallel those identified at the national level, e.g. childhood obesity, family economics, organic agriculture.

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:

This section is extremely well written. Examples of how stakeholder input have been used (e.g., addition of parenting education to the Human Development program) are provided.

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:

Generally, the descriptions of planned programs are well written. There are still some programs, e.g. Youth Development, Family Economics that reference a single Knowledge Area and could cross reference others.

General Recommendations:

Overall this is an excellent plan. There are still a few areas that could expand the number of Knowledge Areas referenced.

We hereby recommend CSREES acceptance of this Plan of Work.

Etta Saltos /s/ _____
NPL Signature

06/06/2009 _____
Date

Greg Crosby /s/ _____
NPL Signature

06/06/2009 _____
Date