2014 Ohio State University Combined Research and Extension Annual Report of Accomplishments and Results Review

Status: Accepted Date Accepted: 05/05/2015				
2014 Ohio State University Combined Research and Extension Annual Report of Accomplishments and Results Review				
State: Ohio				
Institution(s):				
Ohio State University				
Type of Report (Check all that apply)				
1862 Research				
1862 Extension				
1890 Research				
1890 Extension				
Tuskegee Research				
Tuskegee Extension				
NPL Reviewers:				
Anne Lichens-Park				

Report Date 05/05/2015 Page 1 of 3

Report Overview Section (Required):				
Acceptable				
YES	NO			
\checkmark		Executive summary. (Suggested in Guidance)		
\checkmark		Total FTEs are included for each appropriate institution of the Report		
Comments:				
The Executive Summary for the 2014 Annual Report is well written and describes important activities that took place over the last year. The 2014 Executive Summary makes a strong case for the value of the work done by the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center (OARCD), Ohio State University Extension (OSUE) and the College of Food, Agriculture and Environmental Sciences (CFAES) in support of Ohio's \$107+ billion agricultural industry. Strong examples are the OSUE signature programs "Nutrient Stewardship for Cleaner Water" and "Live Healthy Live Well," and the OARDC research to find alternatives to harmful food dyes.				
Merit/Program Review Process Section (Required):				
Acceptable				
YES	NO			
\checkmark		At least one process has been checked (including other) (required)		
OARDC and OSU Extension employ several types of merit review and peer review. They use program and publication review by stakeholders, internal and external peer review and review by external specialists. On their review committees, they strive for diversity in numerous categories such as geography, age race/ethnicity, gender, socio-economic status, program area and political affiliation.				
Stakeholder Input Process Section (Required):				
Acceptable				
YES	NO			
\checkmark		(a) Actions taken to seek stakeholder input that encourages their participation (Required)		
\checkmark		(b) Method used to identify groups and individuals (Required)		
$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$		(c) Method used for collecting stakeholder input (Required)		

Comments:

⊻

OARDC, OSU Extension and CFAES put extensive effort into obtaining meaningful stakeholder engagement. They use surveys and meetings with a variety of individuals and groups. This section includes specific examples of efforts to obtain broad input, such as the "VP Conversations on the Future of Extension" project. OARDC responded to a recent crisis for Ohio's wine grape growers. The "polar vortex" winter of 2013-2014 significantly damaged the grape vines. OARDC taught a workshop on pruning winter-damaged vines so that the grape growers could return to full production as soon as possible. Examples such as this one show how OARDC is being responsive to stakeholder issues and concerns.

(d) A statement of how collected input will be considered (Required)

Report Date 05/05/2015 Page 2 of 3

Planned Programs Section (Required):				
Acceptable				
YES	NO			
\checkmark		Used Appropriate Logic Model Elements		
V		Input Dollars Expended on Each Planned Program		
V		Appropriate Knowledge Areas		
\checkmark		Appropriate Outputs for each Program		
\checkmark		Appropriate Outcomes for each Program		
Comments: The Planned Program section of the 2014 Annual Report is well written. Some of the outcome statements that seemed particularly strong include the following: OSU Extension's use of webinars to educate people about Climate Change; OARDC's work aimed at developing wheat varieties that are more resistant to wheat blast as part of the Plant Systems Program; OARDC's work to develop diagnostic tests for porcine epidemic diarrhea virus and vaccine candidates as part of the Animal Systems Program, and OSU Extension's efforts to teach landowners about nutrient management best practices as part of the Enhancing Agriculture and the Environment Program. The program portfolio is diverse and provides convincing examples of impact.				
General Recommendations: The 2014 Ohio State University Annual Report is well written and has been significantly updated as compared to the 2013 Ohio State University Annual Report. The changes have improved the report such that it now does an even better job of documenting accomplishments and the impacts of those accomplishments. We hereby recommend NIFA acceptance of this Annual Report.				
Anne Lichens-Park /s/ 05/01/2015				

Date

Report Date 05/05/2015 Page 3 of 3

NPL Signature