



Cornell University

Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station (Ithaca)
Cornell Cooperative Extension
New York State Agricultural Experiment Station (Geneva)

P.C. Update

A periodic electronic newsletter to members of the Applied Research and Extension Program Councils of Cornell Cooperative Extension (CCE), the Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station in Ithaca (CUAES), and the New York State Agricultural Experiment Station in Geneva (NYSAES)

This issue of **P.C. Update** offers a summary of 2005-06 federal formula funding decisions made by CUAES, CCE and NYSAES on research, extension and integrated preproposals submitted by Cornell faculty last fall.

Tables of projects that have been advanced for funding can be viewed by clicking on the following links: (*To return to this page, click on the "Back" button in your web browser*)

[Agriculture and Food Systems](#)
[Community and Economic Vitality](#)
[Natural Resources and Environment](#)
[Quality of Life for Individuals and Families](#)
[Youth Development](#)

As you may recall, this past winter we sought input from off-campus stakeholders on the relevancy of proposed projects and how directly they related to priorities developed by the councils in 2003.

Beyond off-campus stakeholders serving on the program councils, input on preproposals was also solicited from:

- the applicant's department chair, to help us gain a sense of such things as scientific merit, the importance of the proposed work to department goals or the faculty member's professional development, and the capacity of the applicant to productively pursue such work;
- the three CUAES associate directors, representing the Colleges of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Human Ecology, and Veterinary Medicine;
- the five CCE program directors, who offered their own perspective on preproposals that were germane to their statewide program areas; and
- other external stakeholders (not serving on the councils), where appropriate.

In addition, preproposals were weighed as to how well they supported national goals and program direction emphasized by USDA, and, in the case of CUAES and NYSAES, how they might maintain or nurture vital research expertise within the university.

Off-campus stakeholder input became the “first filter” through which all 113 submitted research and extension preproposals were passed and assessed. Clearly, such input played a key role in a preproposal’s advancement to the full proposal/funding stage.

For example, the “first cut” screening of CUAES research preproposals involved identifying those that received a medium or higher rating (greater than 3.0 on the 5-point scale) from council/external reviewers, CCE directors, the appropriate department chair(s), and the appropriate CUAES associate director(s). Thirty (30) research preproposals made this very top grouping, and we are pleased to say that 24 preproposals (80%) from this group have been advanced for funding, including 13 of the 14 rated most highly (having a relevancy rating of greater than or equal to 4.00 on the 5-point scale) by council/external reviewers.

In another example, of the 23 integrated (research + extension) preproposals submitted to CUAES and CCE for joint funding, 17 were advanced to receive some level of support from either CUAES, CCE, or both. Of these, 16 received positive (greater than 3.0 on the 5-point scale) relevancy ratings from the councils and other external reviewers.

On the extension side, despite a continuing decline in the buying power of federal funds received, CCE was at least able to fund (in whole or part) the majority (10) of the 15 extension-only preproposals submitted by faculty. Of the selected extension preproposals, all but one had very strong council/external relevancy ratings (greater than 3.5, and averaging 4.0).

Lastly, research preproposals to be funded by NYSAES-Geneva all received above average (average rating: 3.6) relevancy reviews from off-campus council members and other externals.

Any incongruities between a P.C. rating and the funding decision were likely due to:

- contrasting reviews and input from more than one council, the appropriate CCE extension director, the applicant’s department chair, or a CUAES associate director;
- a need to make investments more attuned to USDA priorities, or to particular faculty or departmental development needs;
- other special extenuating circumstances.

Please understand that, in the case of research or integrated preproposals, our process requires the prospective grantee/investigator to submit a full proposal for further review by Cornell faculty peers and also by USDA. As a result, our decisions on those preproposals only reflect our intent to fund, based on the presumption that additional reviews will not uncover issues that would preclude our offering federal formula fund support.

We again extend our thanks to those P.C. members who participated in the relevancy review process. The relevancy ratings were a key factor in the process of deciding on over \$4.5 million in federal formula funding allocations to new applied research and extension programs over the next 3 years.

Feel free to e-mail us at cuaes@cornell.edu if you have any questions.

[Click here to return to CUAES Home Page](#)