

**USDA-CSREES FY 2006 STATE ANNUAL REPORT
REVIEW TEAM SUMMARY**

State: Wisconsin

Institution: Wisconsin Cooperative Extension

State Contact: Richard Klemme, Interim Dean and Director

Type of Report: Extension 1862

NPL Reviewers: Robert Nowierski and Barbara Stone

This Review Team Summary reflects the consensus opinion of the review team members regarding the Annual Report.

Strengths of the Impact Statements in the Planned Programs: (Related to important impacts and any other statements that highlight programmatic strength)

Wisconsin's Cooperative Extension State Annual Report of Accomplishment for 2006 describes some outstanding examples of documented impacts as a result of Cooperative Extension efforts. Relative to Goal 1, Statewide Dairy Team work groups demonstrated many impacts that included improved productivity, labor efficiency and profitability, improved herd health, milk quality and profitability, impacts due to training to regional and international Spanish-speaking dairy workers which led to herd health, improved milk quality and production efficiency. These impacts are very useful at the national level in demonstrating the value and impact of formula funds and in justifying the continuance of formula fund programs in the future.

While not all planned programs were able to demonstrate long-term impacts, a number of programs showed progress towards standardized data handling and analysis procedures and additional data.

It was reported that campus and county faculty and staff report their work against expected outcomes through Cooperative Extension's Planning and Results System (PRS). They also submit more detailed success stories of their work for the PRS database.

Weaknesses of the Impact Statements in the Planned Programs:

None noted. In all cases, outcomes and impacts of planned programs were well documented. Long term impacts were more evident and significant. Wisconsin's Cooperative Extension Program should be commended for their efforts to reach, educate and train some of the state's most vulnerable populations.

Stakeholder Input Process Comments: (make comments on the three requirements on the checklist)

Multiple approaches to seek stakeholder input include formal surveys, focus groups, key informants, advisory councils (collaborating groups, agencies, schools, service providers, and organizations) and combinations of these approaches. Although there is not specific attention given to input from under-served or underrepresented, these audiences are clearly involved in the program planning and delivery stages of programming.

Program Review Process Comments:

Instructional materials were developed to train county-based faculty and staff and county government oversight committees and advisory committees to help them better understand the importance of seeking a broad base of stakeholder input at the community level. Local issues and concerns were gathered statewide and made available for review by all county-based faculty and staff and campus faculty with

research and extension appointments. The county "issues and concerns" and "Trends Analysis" documents noted above served as the foundation for creating nearly 50 statewide programming teams of campus and county faculty and staff and their community partners. Each team prepared a plan of work that identified the community need, the extension response, educational resources and partners.

Evaluation of the Success of Multi and Joint Activities Comments:

The Wisconsin Cooperative Extension Program review and Merit review remain the same as previously submitted and are being revised through 2007-2008 statewide program planning.

Multistate Extension Comments: (If Applicable) (provide comments on Accomplishments, or lack thereof, in spending formula funds)

Evaluations of multi-state and joint activities were included under each goal and there is strong evidence that they are addressing issues of real importance to Wisconsin and demonstrating outcome and impact data relative to the five USDA goals. Multi-state and joint activities included the following: Adding value to new and old agricultural products (MI, OH); Leadership training and Development, Youth Development / 4-H; Food handling, Food quality, Food safety; Human health, Human nutrition; and Agricultural waste management, Water quality.

Integrated Research and Extension Comments: (provide comments on Accomplishments, or lack thereof, in spending formula funds)

Integrated research and extension strategies appear to be well established and are resulting in productive relationships. There appears to be broad representation by research and extension faculty on program leadership teams and in some cases stakeholders and end users. Team responsibilities include planning, implementation and evaluation of their respective program areas.

Final General Comments:

This is an outstanding document and a pleasure to read. The outcomes and impacts reported will contribute significantly how Extension is providing value to citizens and further justify the continuance of formula funds.