2020 University of Tennessee Knoxville and Tennessee State University Combined Research and Extension Plan of Work Review

Status: Final Date: 2019-07-17 19:57:13 UTC

| Plan Overview | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Recommend Approval? | | | | | | |
| Approve X | Return | Executive Summary: The summary follows suggested guidance. | | | | |
| Approve X | Return | FTE Estimates: Total FTEs are included for each appropriate institution of the plan. | | | | |
| Tennessee St research and broadly define every five doll two institution organized to e | at university systemate University (TS extension programed to include the agars of the state's each has a different of efficiently produce | n in Tennessee is comprise of University of Tennessee (UT) and U). They work both independently and collaboratively to conduct it is in all 95 counties for the state's 6.7 million residents. Agriculture – gricultural and natural resource sciences – generates almost one of economy and totals more than \$60 billion annually. While each of the rganizational and academic structure, both UT and TSU are new knowledge and transfer it to end users. | | | | |
| Merit Review | | | | | | |
| Recommend . | Approval? | | | | | |
| Approve X | Return | At least one merit and scientific review process is described. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Review Comments:

Both institutions have established and effective merit and peer review structures to ensure that programs pursue rigorous and relevant science. UT utilized a panel of Extension administrators, program leaders and scholars from four states to review and approved the criteria that are used in merit reviews. Research projects undergo a more rigorous review at UT. At TSU planned program outcomes are vetted by faculty focus groups and the College of Agriculture administration. These processes ensure that issues that are critical to Tennesseans are pursued in a manner that produces useful outcomes.

Stakeholder Input

| Recommend Approval? | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------|---|--|--|--|
| Approve X | Return | Describes what action(s) will be taken to seek stakeholder input that encourages stakeholder participation. | | | |
| Approve X | Return | Describes what method(s) will be used to identify groups and individuals from whom to collect input. | | | |
| Approve X | Return | Describes what method(s) will be used for collecting stakeholder input. | | | |
| Approve X | Return | Describes how input collected will be considered in program planning. | | | |

Review Comments:

Actions taken to seek stakeholder input that encourages stakeholder participation:

Both institutions utilize a variety of approaches and mechanisms to seek stakeholder input, including advisory committees, involvement in trade and commodity groups, and partnerships with state and federal agencies that have perspectives that are useful to research and extension leaders.

Method(s) used to identify groups and individuals from whom to collect input:

UT and TSU Extension engage with their extensive, statewide network of advisory groups for stakeholder input and to identify other groups and individuals from whom input should be collected. UT research utilizes regional advisory committees comprised of commodity groups, individuals, and state agencies. TSU research does not utilize any signle approach to identifying individual stakeholders to solicit input from.

Methods used for collecting stakeholder input:

UT Extension trains and utilizes Extension Agents in conducting needs assessments to identify the most important and pressing needs for stakeholders. UT AgResearch conducts semi-annual face-to-face meetings with regional advisory committees to provide updates on priority programs that stakeholders have identified and to solicit input on issues that need to addressed. TSU collects stakeholder input primarily in face-to-face discussions, interactions with commodity groups, or survey instruments. Both institutions have effective methods for collecting stakeholder input.

How input collected will be considered in program planning:

Both institutions have numerous examples of how stakeholder input translated into new programs and/or modifications of existing programs. TSU utilizes input to determine what faculty positions are high priority for recruiting and filling.

Critical Issues

| Recommend | Approval? | | |
|-----------|-----------|---|--|
| Approve X | Return | Critical Issues are appropriate for the state, include relevant Science Emphasis Area associations, and have an appropriate term (i.e.,Short-Term, Intermediate, or Long-Term). | |

Review Comments:

UT and TSU have identified five critical issues and the supporting areas of science that will be the focus of research and extension efforts: 1) Supporting Food, Fiber, and Energy Systems; 2) Enhancing Biodiversity and Environmental Quality; 3) Enriching Our Economy; 4) Developing Our Workforce; and 5) Strengthening Our Health

These five overarching critical issues are key to the quality of life of Tennesseans, the care and maintenance of the natural environment, the vibrancy of the food and agriculture enterprise, and the development of the next generation of leaders and workers for Tennessee.

General Recommendations

Recommend Approval?

Review Comments:

This Plan of Work documents the future activities of the Tennessee land-grant universities and their research and extension activities. Both institutions continue to identify, engage with, and utilize stakeholders and their input to ensure that their highest priority needs are attended to. This reviewer acknowledges the outstanding program planning and delivery of both institutions as they continue a long tradition of outstanding programs that address current and future needs of Tennesseans.