

ARS □ CSREES □ ERS □ NASS

Policies and Procedures

Title: Policy, Procedures, and Responsibilities for Documenting and Coordinating AR Program Reviews and Workshops

Number: 600.6

Date: 9/26/79

Originating Office: Office of Deputy Director for Agricultural Research

This Replaces:

Distribution: Headquarters, Regions, Areas/Centers, and Locations

This Directive establishes policy, responsibility, and procedures for documenting and coordinating the orderly and comprehensive assessment of SEA-AR research programs through reviews and workshops.

Table Of Contents

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|---|
| 1. | Abbreviations | 3 |
| 2. | Forms | 3 |
| 3. | Background | 3 |
| 4. | Policy | 3 |
| 5. | Definitions | 4 |
| 6. | Responsibility | 5 |
| 7. | Scheduling | 5 |
| 8. | Organization of a PRW | 5 |
| 9. | Reporting | 6 |
| 10. | Follow up | 6 |
| | Exhibit 1 | 7 |
| | Exhibit 2 | 8 |

1. Abbreviations

AR - Agricultural Research
NPS - National Program Staff
PRW - Program Review and Workshop
AD/CD - Area Director/Center Director

2. Forms

SEA-20, Scheduled Agricultural Research Program Review or Workshop (Exhibit 1) (Local reproduction)
SEA-21, Agricultural Research Program Review or Workshop Summary Report (Exhibit 2) (Local reproduction)

3. Background

The procedures given in this Directive are designed to improve overall coordination of program reviews and workshops, and to provide for the documentation of program-related findings. Also, the procedures simplify the process of approval of PRW's and provide for maintenance of an accessible, up-to-date record of program reviews and workshops planned and accomplished. In addition, the procedures provide for the "Annual Plan" and "Documentation" of PRW's required by the Office of Management and Budget and the Joint Planning and Evaluation Staff. This Directive broadens the definition of program reviews and workshops to ensure greater participation of scientists in the process. Many previously undocumented sessions will now be documented as PRW's. Few additional PRW's should be necessary, however. In addition, this Directive provides an orderly scheduling of PRW's for the periodic review of all programs. Recommendations will be followed up automatically at the next review. There will no longer be a distinction between "formal" and "informal" PRW's.

4. Policy

A review (either a program review or workshop as defined in Section F) of the research conducted by each scientist will be performed at least once every 3 years.

All reviews of research programs and recommendations must be documented to ensure that all interested parties are advised of scheduling of and results of the review, to prevent duplication of reviews, to identify programs that have not been reviewed, and to permit followup action.

Approval to conduct PRW is implicit in the process of organizing a review.

5. Definitions

Program Reviews are scheduled in advance and both line administrators and NPS are informed and usually participate. The reviews are organized to evaluate the relevance of current and projected research in terms of SEA's mission and established priorities, to assess progress and productivity, to determine the effectiveness of team research and cooperative endeavors, to consider the assignment of personnel and the allocation of resources and facilities, to consider the need for program changes and redirections, and to develop recommendations designed to strengthen research. Program reviews are classified as multilocation, single location, and special.

- **Multilocation Reviews** assess program involving AR scientists at more than one location. They are usually organized by NPS in consultation with Technical Advisors and line administrators, and may include scientists from universities and representatives from industry. These in-depth reviews involve the examination of research on a given commodity or on a specific problem area.

EXAMPLES: Review of Range Research within SEA-AR or Review of Photosynthesis Research within SEA-AR.

- **Single Location Reviews** assess the total program at individual work locations, or, in the case of large centers, a manageable segment of the total program. They are usually organized by either NPS or line administrators with mutual consultation, and may involve participation of SEA-AR scientists from other locations with representatives from universities and industry.

EXAMPLES: Review of Insect Physiology Program, Beltsville, Maryland, or Review of Veterinary Entomology and Toxicology Laboratory, College Station, Texas

- **Special Reviews** assess **specific** programs at individual work locations. They are usually organized by either line administrators or NPS with mutual consultation. Participation includes line administrators, research leaders, NPS, and, as appropriate, cooperating scientists. Major emphasis is devoted to the local work situation and to interactions within the location and with cooperators.

EXAMPLES: Review of Mushroom Research in the Vegetable Laboratory, Beltsville, Maryland, or Review of Poisonous Plant Research, Logan, Utah.

Workshops are intended to be problem-solving or research-planning meetings devoted to specific topics. They may be functional or commodity oriented and national, regional, or local. EXAMPLES: National Agricultural Chemical Transport Model; Erosion Problems in Wheat and Small Grain Production in the Northwest, Indian Meal Moth and Related Pests; Production Problems of Small Grains in the North Central Region.

Workshops are scheduled to review the "state of the art" in a field or discipline, to identify problem areas, to coordinate plans, and to provide for interchange among scientists. Workshops are planned, conducted, and attended by scientists with expertise in the field or discipline. They are usually initiated and scheduled by NPS in consultation with technical advisors, research leaders, and line administrators.

6. Responsibility

Line or staff can organize any type of review (multilocation, single location, or special) or workshop. Usually, it will be the responsibility of the NPS to organize multilocation reviews and workshops and the responsibility of line administrators to organize single location and special reviews. The organizer of the review will obtain the approval of the involved line and staff before scheduling the review. Also, the organizer will handle all documentation of the review. AD/CD's are responsible for ensuring that each scientist's program is reviewed every 3 years.

7. Scheduling

By October 1, each year, Regional Administrators and the Assistant Deputy Director, NPS, will submit a copy of SEA-20 for each PRW planned for the next fiscal year to the Deputy Director for AR. When circumstances arise that warrant a PRW that has not been scheduled, an additional PRW may be scheduled by sending a copy of SEA-20 through the Regional Administrator or Assistant Deputy Director, NPS, to the Deputy Director for AR. When PRW's are rescheduled or canceled, the Deputy Director for AR will be advised by submitting an amended SEA-20 as above. The Deputy Director for AR will periodically publish a schedule of PRW's. The Deputy Director for AR will prepare an annual plan for PRW's and will provide copies to the Joint Planning and Evaluation Staff; AR line administrators; AD/CD's; Assistant Deputy Director, NPS; and each NPS coordinator by November 1 of each year.

8. Organization of a PRW

Careful structuring of the review sessions is necessary to ensure development of needed information, efficient use of time, and constructive decisions following a review.

9. Reporting

Within 30 calendar days after the PRW, the organizer will prepare a **summary** report (not to exceed two pages) and send it to the Deputy Director for AR (SEA-21). This Directive does not

require the preparation of a detailed report. However, the involved Regional Administrators, AD/CD's, NPS staff scientists involved, or higher officials may request a detailed report. Preparation of a detailed report, when necessary, will be the responsibility of the organizer of the review. Both the PRW report (SEA-21) and the detailed report, if prepared, should be sent to scientists who participated in the review and to others at the discretion of the organizer of the review. Appropriate staff and line participants shall always receive copies.

10. Follow up

Unless a specific recommendation for followup is developed at the review, the next review will constitute the followup. This review must occur within 3 years (see Policy 1). Any followup on PRW's that cannot be accommodated or postponed for consideration at a subsequent PRW should be initiated and documented by line or staff and sent to the Deputy Director for AR to file with the original summary report (SEA-21).

T. W. Edminster
Deputy Director for Agricultural Research

Exhibits

1 Form SEA-20
2 Form SEA-21

Exhibit 1

SCHEDULED AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PROGRAM REVIEW OR WORKSHOP

INSTRUCTIONS: 1. Submit one planned review or workshop per form. 2. If more space is needed FOR ODD USE ONLY attach additional pages and identify by entry number. 3. Send original to the Deputy Director for FILE NO. Agricultural Research, and copies to participating scientists and appropriate staff and line officials. |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. NAME AND ADDRESS OF ORGANIZER | 2 TYPE |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Multilocation <input type="checkbox"/> Single location |
| | Review Review |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Special <input type="checkbox"/> Workshop |
| | Review |
| | 3 PRW ACTION |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Schedule |
| PHONE NO (include area code) | <input type="checkbox"/> Reschedule |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Cancel |

4. TITLE OF REVIEW OR WORKSHOP

5. NRP AND CRIS NUMBERS INCLUDED

6 LOCATION | DATES

7 PARTICIPANTS

8 REASON FOR REVIEW

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| 9 DATES OF PREVIOUS REVIEWS (Give NRP, CRIS and date reviewed) | SIGNATURE OF ORGANIZER |
| | DATE |

Exhibit 2

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PROGRAM REVIEW OR WORKSHOP SUMMARY REPORT

INSTRUCTIONS: 1. Submit within 30 calendar days after PRW. 2. Send original to the Deputy Director for Agricultural Research and copies to participating scientists and appropriate staff and line officials.

6. NAME AND ADDRESS OF ORGANIZER | 2. REVIEW FILE NO. (From SEA-20)

PHONE NO. (Include area code)

3. TYPE

- Multilocation Review
- Single location Review
- Special Review
- Workshop

4. TITLE OF REVIEW OR WORKSHOP

5. NRP AND CRIS NUMBERS INCLUDED

6. LOCATION HELD

DATES HELD

7. PARTICIPANTS (Identify scientist reviewed affiliation of all, and glue number of participating days for each.)

8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING FROM REVIEW (Include followup on previous review. Attach additional pages—not to exceed 2—if needed.)

9. WILL THERE BE A DETAILED REPORT?

- YES (Give location of complete review file)
- NO

SIGNATURE OF ORGANIZER

DATE