

2009 University of Alaska Combined Research and Extension Plan of Work Review

2009 University of Alaska Combined Research and Extension Plan of Work Review

State: Alaska
Institutions(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• University of Alaska
Type of Report (Check all that apply) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1862 Research<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1862 Extension<input type="checkbox"/> 1890 Research<input type="checkbox"/> 1890 Extension<input type="checkbox"/> Tuskegee Research<input type="checkbox"/> Tuskegee Extension
NPL Reviewers: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Diana Jerkins• Luis Tupas

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 description of the various components of the Alaska land-grant system and their services to the state and the local communities. The need to diversify the economy is a priority issues and all three components are working together to achieve that end result. The mission statements of the school, experiment station and the extension service show their commitment and strong collaboration between all three groups. Overall, this is a good executive summary.

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:

A merit review process was well described and involves a rigorous and well established process. Review panels are used extensively and extension projects undergo a separate external review form the Western Region. Overall, this is a robust process that has served the system well.

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:

An evaluation process was well described and adequately addresses all the required questions. Multi-state projects and joint activities were outlined and show a direct connection to the indigenous peoples of the state. The plan of work has made the research and extension components focus on outputs and outcomes in a way that helps them better serve the community. Overall, this component of the plan was well prepared.

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:

Sources of stakeholder input has been collected by several means, including surveys and direct contact with individuals and organizations that are impacted by the programs provided from research and extension activities. Stakeholders are involved to help develop the primary selected focus areas to be implemented going ahead with the revised the strategic plan. The methods used to involve stakeholders and responses to their inputs are appropriate.

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 five major programs related to agricultural production, environmental management and community development. With the minimal agricultural infrastructure in Alaska, community food security is an important issue. The research and extension activities focus on small scale agriculture for home and professional growers, and include efficient farming practices and pesticide education. There is also a focus on workforce development in this area. The need to manage Alaska's fragile ecosystem, especially its forests and soils impact a large stakeholder community. Natural resource managers are in need of research and extension services for information on climate change, boreal forest management and soil inventory. Emerging natural resources issues in agriculture, mining and other economic activities will determine research and outreach priorities. Community development has been linked with natural resources in a significant way to enhance adaptation to climate change and provide a sustainable quality of life for individuals, families and communities. The school will provide its youth development programs with science-based competencies that promote workforce development and personal goal attainment. The high priorities given to the effects of climate change on tundra and permafrost landscapes, petroleum availability and cost on rural communities, and greater food self-sufficiency will lead to more sustainable human and natural communities. Overall, the planned programs cover the important issues faced by the state and have realistic goals for outputs and outcomes. This is a good work plan.

General Recommendations:

Overall this is a well prepared and well written plan of work. The issues and goals are clear. The methods are well developed and the stakeholders have been properly identified. Expanding the partnership between research and extension will allow a process to provide research results to educational and outreach activities. The school, experiment station and extensions service are working together to achieve these goals and are doing their best to overcome the resource and environmental challenges of their work. A well organized Plan of Work.

We hereby recommend CSREES acceptance of this Plan of Work.

Diana Jerkins /s/

 NPL Signature

06/17/2008

 Date

Luis Tupas /s/

 NPL Signature

06/17/2008

 Date