

SWOT

SWOT stands for Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats, and is a simple framework for generating strategic alternatives from a situation analysis. The SWOT analysis provides information that is helpful in matching the Centers' resources and capabilities to the competitive environment in which we operate.

Strengths: (number of votes)

Director dedicated to the Center and Staff (5)
Have money to fund things (1)
Infrastructure for clearing house (1)
Represents Southern IPM interests (1)
Regionalizing grant money (1)
Unique links to CIPM and APHIS (2)
Computer/IT skills (6)
Delivery (info/IT) (1)
Diversity of stakeholder representation (1)
Shared resources – media, pubs, distribute tools (2)
Link to other regional programs (1)
Jo-Anne (4)
One on one help with IPM coordinators (1)
Ability to answer EPA (1)
No pride – willing to problem solve (1)
CSREES relation (1)
Inter-regional coordination (1)
Diverse staff skill (2)

Cross reference information and distribution
Significant expertise in numerous disciplines – collective
Transparent communication
Networking between and among different agencies
Forum for stakeholders
Flexibility and discretion to program at local and regional level
Authoritative source at regional level
Insightful and inciting people
Coordination among states
Outstanding facilities
Ability to structure non duplicative/through process

Weakness: (number of votes)

Lack of defined goals (8)
The umbrella – where do other federal programs fit (eg. IR-4, PSEP) (3)
Funding inadequate (2)

Rules of the Federal Centers Grant constraining (1)
Mission Drift creep (2)
Priority setting (14)
Need to demonstrate clear cost/benefit payoff (1)
Lack of creative solutions to problems (4)
Info distribution to 1890 (4)
Emphasis on pesticide issues (4)
Not connecting enough to beneficiaries of IPM (2)
Disconnect between Center and institutional (research, etc) (4)
Corporate memory (1)
Clear sense of AC/SC member roles, more discussion, less reports (1)
Advocacy for IPM (2)

IPM facilitator

Formal process to make decisions (include funding)
Advisory Council still misses interest groups
Ability to say no quickly
Time of Advisory Council and Steering Committee members
Orientation of the group is highly institutional
Poorly defined roles of volunteer leadership
Lack of ID within states and within Administrations at land grant universities
IN grant programs, some projects too situationally specific

Opportunities: (number of votes)

Southern region in best position ever to get IPM implemented (1)
Southern region in best position ever to document money impact (9)
To find or develop and disseminate priority-setting tools
Pesticides environmental impact related to environmental impact (service by centers, IT work) (8)
Take advantage of conservation programs to advance adoption (7)
Foster research and development opportunities (Center has a bigger picture) (1)
Develop a set of tools that reflect intrinsic value of IPM to end users (6)
More collaboration with grass-roots organizations (2)
Help states do IT – host ways to gather data (e.g. surveys) (8)
Greater leverage of other funding (4)
Facilitate groups putting together proposals (1)
Assemble expertise and use that to attract funding (1)
Congressional outreach or coordination of same (tours, etc) (2)
Work with other institutions (e.g. SPDN) (3)
Make headlines when good ones can be made (3)
Develop 3 one-pagers: what we do for you (stakeholders, institutions clients, admins) (8)
Close collaboration with EPA and NRCS including regional (1)
Outreach to inst. groups – sponsor symposiums/conferences etc (8)
Improve relationships with IP cords in the region (2)

To find or develop and disseminate priority setting tools
Develop mechanism to convince groups that can advocate our value
Influence granting through good (objective and well-defined) priority setting
More cohesive grant program that reflects more cohesive priorities
Provide creative solutions
Links among states, efficiency
Be a parasite of CIPM/APHIS work

Threats: (number of votes)

Funding cuts we don't control (2)
Unfunded mandates (7)
Loss of applied scientist expertise (1)
Lack of staff depth (1)
Unable to ID international issues before they reach our shores (1)
Coverage/involvement of all states and territories in our region (1)
Way federal funds (3d) are distributed (7)
Guard against dilution against efficacy (2)
Addition of administrative requirements that diminish program ability (1)
Indiscriminate disassociation of IPM from chemical solutions (13)

Pork

Lack of impact doc and marketing threatens obsolescent of perceptions of value