

SRRC REVIEW

Everett Emino, Administrative Advisor
Subject: Review of Regional Research Project S103

Dr. Emino,

Members of SRRC have reviewed the project outline for S-103, Technical and Economic Efficiencies of Producing, Marketing and Managing Environmental Plants. Two reviewers recommended acceptance without revision while others suggested some level of revision. This project remains one of the few regional projects that demonstrates good collaboration between economists and plant scientists and has a long history of accomplishment. Overall the project was well organized and clearly written. In particular, the committee did a good job of addressing the comments and suggestions of the outside reviewers.

Comments by section:

Justification

The justification clearly explains the need for regional coordination and collaboration among the institutions.

Current and Previous work

The outline does a good job of showing how the project will build upon previous work conducted by the group. There is no duplication with other regional work.

Objectives

The objectives are clear and concise. There was some concern by one reviewer that the objectives were too broad and general to be attainable during the project period.

Procedures

Details on experimental design were limited but most reviewers were not overly concerned given the broad nature of the project. Leaders were identified for each of the objectives but the project would benefit from adding additional detail on how the information will be tied together. Are any regional publications planned? State code (AK) for objective two on page 18 should be corrected.

Organization

The organization was described adequately.

Attachments

The list of participants and research specializations were included (Einert should be listed as a horticulturalist rather than an economist). Resource commitments were included as required. Although the participating states were listed for each objective, the table would benefit from including the participation by objective. The publications section would benefit from listing publications over the last project period in a separate section.

General comments

Overall, I would recommend minor revision to address the need to demonstrate how each objective will be coordinated by clearly indicating who will collect and collate the data and how the information will be handled. Any anticipated joint publications should be identified. Other suggested noted above should be addressed.

Please provide me with a revised draft of the outline with an account of how the committee addressed the comments of the SRRC reviewers. I will then forward the revised document to the executive director for signature.

G. J. Weidemann
Associate Director/Associate Dean

RESPONSE TO SRRC REVIEW

In response to the project proposal review by the Southern Regional Research Committee (SRRC), the following adjustments have been made to the project proposal:

1. Additional comments have been added to each objective to more clearly identify how the information will be tied together. Planned regional publication efforts have also been identified.
2. One reviewer noted that the objectives seemed to be too broad and general to be attainable during the project period. While the objectives have been restated slightly to provide greater detail, the writing committee would like to indicate for the record that the objectives were purposely stated in this fashion in order to facilitate as much regional interaction as possible. Given the eclectic nature of the individual research efforts that exist in the Southern Region, objectives that were narrower in scope would hinder interactive research efforts on the part of committee members. Additionally, the committee has set a precedent for excellent collaborative efforts during previous project periods in which the project proposal objectives were stated in similar fashion.
3. The state code for Arkansas under objective 2 on page 12 has been corrected.
4. Correction duly noted regarding Einert's field of study. Einert is listed as a horticulturist rather than an economist in the table on page 25.
5. The table (page 25) delineating resource commitments was modified to include the participation of each researcher by objective.
6. Publications completed during the last project period were clearly identified by bolding each citation (pp. 48-59).