Initial Report

Last Modified: 03/23/2015

1. Should the POW submission deadline be changed?

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Yes		13	33%
2	No		27	68%
	Total		40	100%

2. The beginning of what month makes the most sense to you?

Text Response
March
October
June
July (3)
May
November
May

3. Should the Annual Report submission deadline be changed?

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Yes		7	18%
2	No		31	82%
	Total		38	100%

4. The beginning of what month makes the most sense to you?

Text Response
February (2)
November
June
July
December

5. Please include any comments you have relative to changing the POW or AR deadline.

Text Response

- The current April 1 deadline seems a little long after completion of the fiscal year to report. The accuracy of the information submitted would probably be improved if submitted closer to the end of the fiscal year. Submitting the Plan of Work one month after the Report of Accomplishments would alleviate some of the burden on already overworked employees.
- Our faculty POWs and ROAs come in at the end of the calendar year, so we pull information from these to incorporate into the federal POW and ROA. Having 90 days to pull this together is critical.
- April 1 works on calendar year reporting.
- There is actually a synergy of working on them relatively close together. An institution does not need to wait until near the end to work on the POW as they could do it much earlier than the report if they were to choose. The Christmas break is often considerable at universities and many take extra leave then. That would be a bad time.
- It doesnt matter when it is, we will do it. I am fine with the current time frame because it coincides with the performance reviews I conduct and thus the data needed is easily accessible to build the report.
- Need additional time to thoroughly and thoughtfully review the POW and AR, not just write to meet a deadline. Current deadline is during faculty and staff evaluation time at our university.
- The deadline is not a big problem for my institution.
- Although there is significant work in preparing both reports simultaneous;y having them coincide helps individuals involved in the progress keep in mind the linkages between the reports as they are developed.
- The Annual Report deadline of April 1 works very well for our institution.
- Alabama Cooperative Extension System believes that the joint submission of the POW and AR works well as the two reports complement each other and the state planning and reporting processes.
- at nc state, faculty activity reports are due end of january for the previous calendar year, which fits nicely with the current end of march POW and accomp report date.
- I would use a weighted response from the individuals actually doing the submission. I am probably not the right person to answer these questions.
- We have difficulties in planning and gathering data for the April 1 date, so any change for an earlier submission of either document will put greater stress on our contacts and increase the likelihood of having to request an extension.
- Since the POW and AR follow a similar format and some of the data collected for the AR inform what we project for the POW process, we would continue to work on them around the same time of year even if the due dates were different for each. As for the timing of the due dates for the AR, it is critical that it in not due before the annual Hatch and Multistate progress/ final reports and financials are due to NIFA as these are used heavily to populate the research components of the AR.
- The timing is good for us as we close our Extension reporting mid-January.
- Separating due dates allows more focused attention on our reporting and planning – ultimately better data for NIFA. Completion of the Report of Accomplishments (AR) should precede the POW, which will allow metrics from the RA to inform the subsequent POW.
- The AR deadline makes sense as it gives everyone (county, state, financial services, etc.) time to close out the previous year and then collect the information needed for the RA. Having the POW moved back a few months will help avoid confusion by all involved. Right now, we have specialists who work on both POW and AR writing teams and get one mixed up with the other.
- They should be separated by 90 d - in most states the same personnel contribute to both.
- Many of our departments must compile their department review and faculty reappointment documents starting January of each year. Many use the annual reports as part of the review. We require our Annual reports to be done by the end of December.
- Even slightly offsetting the due dates would be beneficial but should be before the summer field season or break.

6. What challenges do states face when trying to associate projects in REEport to Planned Programs in the POW (currently a requirement at project initiation)?

Text Response

- They do not always line up, so end up forcing some categories and items together.
- It could be streamlined so that all required reports are the same.
- REEport is difficult to use for many faculty and thus their information is often not submitted correctly. I would be a major help to be able to easily use REEport to mine and sort our project report data. For example, there is no easy way to determine how many projects are reporting under a particular program area or CIP code.
- It would be helpful if the list of projects from REEport were visable in the POW portal. The main challenge is paring down the detailed project to REEport to a summary on the POW. If PDs were asked to provide a summary/blub when entering their project into REEport, if would be helpful.
- The two systems need to communicate so information entered in one location will show up in the other. Entering information twice is inefficient.
- The PDs are not rewarded for making any connection between their project and the Planned Programs. They do not understand the relevance of the Planned Programs, they do not care about the report. the quality shows this disconnect.
- One of the biggest issues is the mindset of faculty and administrators that the two reports are for different stakeholders and different purposes. that one report goes here, but not there. the whole idea of integration of research and extension being somehow tied together has not been communicated well nor accepted as a paradigm in either of the states I have worked since the whole "integrated" POW concept has been implemented. NIFA has probably done the most to continue this perception by separating out the CRIS/REEport process from the POW process Now the perception is that REEport is the research planning and reporting system and the POW/ROA is the "Extension" planning and reporting system. The other obvious answer to this question is that our research and our extension programs are not integrated in the first place. That is true in many cases, it's just that we are loathe to admit it and change the situation. Maybe we need more direction in how to accomplish that goal.
- Not directly editable and transportable in WORD or other commonly used software packages etc. POW and REEport are disconnected in time and space. Too detailed on formatting and too repetitive, could be much more streamlined and summarized.
- The Planned Programs tend to be broad and encompass not only Research and Extension, but also the diversities of our 1890 and 1862 institutions. This is a challenging task.
- At this time the Alabama Cooperative Extension System does not link information entered into REEport to planned programs in the POW or annual report. We are unaware of a mechanism to link these systems. Currently, we manually enter information from REEport to the planned programs in the POW and AR.
- getting PDs to assume the responsibility of coding their projects, publications, etc., to associate with the plan of work planned programs. we associate them through HR documentation of appointments (R vs E), but it's a challenge getting to the next step of them documenting scholarly achievements specifically to the planned program(s).
- I believe it how to tie project objectives and indicators for both POW and AR. They should be correlated.
- Our problem (on the research side) is that there are more projects contributing to POW programs than the Hatch & Multistate projects in REEport. A PD may have only one Hatch project associated to the program while holding several that also contribute to the program (and therefore to its final outcomes) but are not included in the REEport database.
- Our college has a large number of planned programs, so generally the challenge occurs when a project really falls under more than one planned program. We have to make a determination of which one to predominantly report outputs and outcomes under in the AR. Faculty sometimes do not know which to choose for their project, so being able to edit that at the Station level is critical to enduring consistent treatment in reporting.

- I map the KAs associated with Hatch projects in the AD-419 to our planned programs. The only difficulty is the KA crosswalk to NIFA five priorities sometimes overlap and I have to estimate.
- There is not a 1:1 correlation between REEport Projects to POW programs. We force a connection using the Knowledge Areas. It does not appear that linkage of individual Hatch projects to State specific Planned Programs is required at project initiation. The Goals/Objectives section of the REEPort Project Initiation form details the Goals/Objectives of the specific Hatch project but does not link these project goals to the AES Planned Program Areas. As such, scientists are not involved in the process of linking their work to programs (in fact, they would be unfamiliar with the programs we report). Consequently, the REEPort forms would have to be modified to accommodate an explicit linkage to PP and scientists would have to be trained to understand how to code this, moving the responsibility for separating our reporting data by program from the administration to the scientist. Under the current system, we retrospectively use Knowledge Areas (from REEPORT project initiations) to apportion our work among PP goals for fiscal and FTE data reporting for the POW.
- The assumption that this question is based on is flawed. There is no association in our state between projects in REEport to planned programs in the POW. This is a major disconnect. One reporting process linking projects under planned programs would provide a better potential for logical linkages. The current disjointed reporting structure actually insures that little to no connection will exist. Tracking by funding source could be simply structured. Show
- I don't deal with projects in REEport so I can't answer your question.
- one difficulty is that many research projects are planned for 4-5 years and if overall state priorities change, it has been difficult to end projects, start new ones in coordination with changed priorities.
- I do not think it is a burden and that the linkage should be shown.

7. How can NIFA assure that Annual Reports clearly show activity and results of both research and extension functions, as appropriate to the various planned programs?

Text Response

- There need to be opportunities to report collectively across R&E where appropriate; however, not everything accomplished cuts across both missions, so in these cases, need to be able to differentiate.
- Honestly, that is a state issue. The accountability leader at the state level has to make that happen.
- Design clear templates that reflect the information that NIFA really wants and then distribute those templates when a project is innitiated.
- Make the forms unsubmittable unless they have information in the spaces provided that cover these topics. perhaps a check box to indicate if it relates to Research, Extension or both.
- Reward the best programs for accomplishments. There is no incentive for a good report. There is no punishment for a bad report.
- Somehow, combine the processes into one clearly communicated system that can still delineate research effort and extension effort. If it involved getting rid of one of the existing systems, so be it. Have a system that is co-designed by state-level practitioners and the NIFA staff. In my 25+ years of working with the various ES-USDA/CSREES/NIFA POW and Annual Report processes, I have not observed and experienced so much frustration on the part of state faculty and administrators in dealing with the POW/ROA processes nor have I seen so little display of concern for the frustration by NIFA. The NIFA staff aren't ugly, but they sure don't seem to be concerned about the concerns we have at the state level in terms of what is being asked for and how it is being asked for.
- Provide good templated examples for different types of programs to follow. This would improve clarity and consistency across states and programs.
- Not sure NIFA can do this other than making it a reporting and funding requirement. Institutions have ultimate responsibility for linking the two functions.
- NIFA should concentrate on outcomes and impacts in the POW.
- We believe this will be accomplished through NIFA's upcoming requirement for joint research and extension POW and AR.
- we show the following in our annual reports: 1. extension refereed articles and research refereed articles 2. IP (including software, DE, etc.) disclosures dependent on research generated or extension generated 3. many of our narrative examples are specified whether they are mostly extension derived or research derived 4. much of our outcome and impact data are obtained from our Extension Reporting System, which largely collects county based outcomes; much of the faculty achievements are captured in the narratives, and often identified with E and/or R. 5. we provide a list of integrated project titles to satisfy our 25% target for integrated programs, which involve faculty with R-E appointment splits.
- Success stories need to be emphasize, to support the numbers given in the indicators.
- I don't have an answer now to this question.
- I'm not familiar enough with the report to weigh in on this. We currently report our Extension and Research planned programs separately although they have the same name (i.e., Global Food Security, Climate Change, etc.) but I want to get away from this and report combined like most other states do. It seems to me there can be research-oriented outcomes and extension-oriented outcomes in the system we have now.
- The ROA is disproportionately structured to better capture Extension-style outcomes than it is for research. For research, progress reports submitted through REEport do a better job of capturing research outputs and outcomes.
- Provide tangible leadership by identifying some key national outcome indicators across priority program areas & provide clear definitions for the uniform measurement and reporting.   Continue to allow states to add indicators, but provide some clarity about what data needs to be uniformly aggregated.   Mist organizations would go out of business if they could not do this.
- Have the system indicate when there is a lack of outcomes reported with a Research tie-in.
- begin to require an extension component in research projects where appropriate down to who is responsible, and link a brief

outreach/impact (or potential impact) report section to each AR.

- In our state, be try to highlight activities and results in the summary sections of the annual reports
- The Annual report (I just did my first one) seems to include both research and Extension fairly well.

8. Could this reduce reporting burden in the POW and Annual Report?

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Yes		18	62%
2	No		11	38%
	Total		29	100%

9. What would be the benefits of this approach?

Text Response

- Some of the work we do is more short-term and fits better as projects. Just need the opportunity to report out on these without a lot of extra reporting burden.
- I don't know what goes on for ES in REEPORT so it was difficult to answer.
- I just dont think that will be that significant of change.
- Reduce redundancy and reflect the actual work that is being done. Most research and extension projects have elements of both research and extension.
- This would be helpful for those compiling the POW and Annual Report.
- Reporting research at the program level can be done even if funds are form multiple sources, within and external to Hatch funds.
- The benefit would be a shorter report.
- If there is such a thing as "projects to programs" (i'm a little skeptical about that), then it would be easy to follow the dots in describing both the planned course from research to extension for those projects and programs. Reporting them into one system would also help reduce burden
- Clarity Connection Comprehension
- The link for project reports would be obvious to those developing the report. However, there would still be significant effort involved in pulling together information for projects not required to be reported so it's unclear if it would reduce the reporting burden.
- It would provide better alignment of research activities to the overall POW. For most institutions, it would strengthen alignment of extension programs.
- This would avoid duplication in preparing the POW and AR. It would provide one system.
- if i understand the scenario, this is similar to our existing process.
- I am not familiar enough with the differences to determine the benefit.
- Some how my understanding is that the Experimental Station works with projects and Extension with programs. If everyone do what they are supposed to do, there should be no confusion. Once the research project is completed it supposed to provide new information as research result to be applied or informed through Extension programs.
- The "yes" is really a "maybe" . I don't know Extension's view on this. For them to transform their programs and initiatives into projects may imply a lot of "burden". And the lengthy narrative of activities may then be transferred to REEport. To get an idea of what's being done under the program would you have to read all the individual project reports?
- If I understand the scenario correctly, it would eliminate the redundant reporting that research currently does, essentially reiterating outputs and outcomes of research in the AR that are already being reported in REEport.
- In theory it sounds good for me as the person completing the POW/AR because it distributes the load. I do think there is potential here if we can submit projects that reflect our existing Extension Roadmap teams of county faculty and state specialists.
- Anything that reduces redundancy between REEport project initiations and POW submissions has potential benefits. Parallel to that would be the REEport annual reports and the ROA. Under the current system, we are essentially doing redundant reporting, once through Hatch annual progress reports and a second time through POW Report of Accomplishments.
- This is only window-dressing. Please have an honest discussion about this. Duplicate reporting will always be what it is. Have one database and mine the data.
- This would divide the work out over the entire year instead of concentrating in one section of year. Also from the limited knowledge I have the of the REEport system, the "projects" approach would keep the program planning process on the minds of our Extension professionals.
- As you stated, "states would no longer need to include such lengthy narratives of activities being done in those programs.'
- easier to associate research being accessible to the public indication of technology transfer more "laymen" type information for the decision

makers
- It would be more integrated.

10. What would be the negatives of this approach?

Text Response

- Will this require further reporting burden than what we already have? This would be a concern.
- Extension faculty are not aware of the project numbers. They are reporting on information useful to stakeholders.
- Tries to jam a square peg in a round hole. Much was lost when Extension was forced to use KAs designed for research. The same problem could continue. 4-H is handled poorly by any type of ES format.
- It would create a burden on those that currently do not enter information into REEport.
- Programs with support for some activities from non-Hatch funds may be difficult to integrate when there is some overlap of activities across funding sources.
- Can't think of them.
- 1. You find out you have few,if any, "projects to programs." This could be a result of no integration of research projects and extension programs, a lack of research support for certain program areas, or any number of other reasons. 2. The "projects to programs" you do identify only represent a certain portion of your total program, which could lead to reduced emphasis on those areas and, subsequently, reduced funding for those programs areas. "Out of sight, out of Mind" 3. Not all extension programs are based on "current" research projects. If they have to be tied together with ongoing research projects to be included in the POW/ROA, many will not be reported in the POW or ROA. "Out of sight, out of mind. 4. Extension programs will probably be the long-term loser in such a "project to programs" system. It's easier for a researcher to say I took my research results and turned it into a program by going to a production meeting or an in-service training and showed my slides. to producers or agents. It's a lot more difficult for the extension educator to say that I took this or that specific research data, used it in my program, clientele learned,adopted and had long-term impacts using that specific research data. The researcher reports the slide presentation and, maybe, how many people showed up. The extension educator has to plan and report how many showed up, how many increased knowledge /skills, how many actually adopted practices and what economic, environmental or social changes took place. I've always wondered why we don't ask the researcher to also be the one who helps document the clientele changes of extension program that are supposed to be based on his or her research, since researchers are supposed to be so good at planning and implementation of data collection procedures. Now that would be a real "project to program" collaboration!
- It would be a change
- It would complicate our current Extension reporting framework because our Extension programs are interdisciplinary, team-based, and don't represent the granularity in the "projects" documentation. The POW/Annual Report process currently works well for Extension as shown by our reviews from National Program Leaders.
- Make sure research and extension are clearly defined and equally represented.
- not a negative but a requirement: regularly and and consistently review existing faculty and projects to make sure they qualify for "integrated" class.
- People don't want to change the way the conduct their work.
- I guess I explained the negatives under my "doubtful" benefits explanation. Without a clearer guidance on how would this be implemented it is difficult to give an opinion.
- Some of our faculty do a poor job of reporting their research projects' impacts and outcomes. The AR process allows us to use other means of capturing those impacts, like press releases or college magazine articles, and report those to NIFA.
- Right now I have 99% compliance with our Extension reporting system. I am worried that I will have less compliance with this system if it is not integrated with or replacing what we already have.
- Extension does not have projects, and as such this approach would increase their workload. If “project to programs” implies a 1:1 relationship, then projects that are cross cutting and currently split between programs would be reported in a single program, this mis-representing the institution’s activity in both programs. Inherently, “project to programs” approach will face problems when programs change

and there are existing, continuing Hatch projects that will need to be reported under two different program structures. It will require historical tracking of the programs, and REEport does not lend itself to historical tracking of projects.

- It is whist it is. Disjointed duplicate reporting systems that few people value or use.
- I can see our specialists balking at it since it would "add" more reporting responsibilities to their plate (in their mind).
- None that I can think of.
- putting teams together on the front end for the duration of the work research and extension faculty would need to partner
- In some states you may have multiple people entering data for the reports (research vs. Extension contact; 1862 rep vs 1890 rep). They would have to be sure to discuss who entered what.
- Requires closer cooperation between research and extension staff on the administrative level.

11. List anything about how the software functions that you particularly like and tell us why?

Text Response

- Can't think of any
- It only marginally works with WORD. Why is there a little "insert for WORD" button in some areas but not in areas like the Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement? In the Outcome "quantitative" block there ought to be a way to show units (%, number, people, acres, etc.) Also it would be nice to have more than one quant block.
- Very user friendly ; cut and paste feature is great
- Nothing...
- The printing features have been greatly improved over the last few years. That is helpful when gathering data.
- Cutting and pasting form Word is useful.
- The version we download into WORD for editing still requires quite a bit of correction and formatting, time-consuming. It would be nice if it were seamless between software platforms but may not be possible?
- Fields are pretty straight forward.
- The software does not require excessive scrolling. This is one of the best features! I very much appreciate the small text boxes for impact reporting. Most impact statements are too long and wordy, and the software forces the user to select the most relevant parts.
- Like popup boxes and cut and paste feature. It is user friendly.
- seems to work well.
- It's user friendly.
- Prepopulated data is time efficient
- Multiple Save buttons, navigation to the various sections is easy.
- Navigation is adequate.
- Our state doesn't use the federal software functions other than to enter data. It is a requirement not a tool.
- Works fine.
- I do like the internal checks in the system.
- Nothing to write home about.
- seems to be user friendly
- I like having everything that we need there and the ability to search by several options. I love being able to see what projects are ending on a given year. It great that I can also see a list of reports still due in the system.
- I didn't have any problems with the software overall. The fonts were rather small on the menus but that may be a function of my computer. I liked that it automatically sent you to the next section and lead you through the reporting.

12. List anything about how the software functions that you particularly dislike and tell us why?

Text Response
- There appears to be a lot of technical issues with the software.
- Awkward to use the system, and very time consuming
- Hard to cut and paste it to send to various team leaders to input data.
- Deletes after 3200 characters which doesn't leave room to really tell your story. Results are "choppy" sometimes.
- Frequently down and often very slow. Does not copy and paste well. Should be compatable with all common word processing software.
- Formatting in the narrative portions gets tricky. It would be nice to be able to have text look exactly how you wish for it to be presented. The auto-indents are frustrating. It would be helpful to have the option to enter data by area (eg. Inputs, Outputs, Outcomes) for all Planned Programs by clicking through the Plans in each section.
- Limited editing capabilities once text is in the forms.
- Pretty clumsy and hard to learn. It took me three years before I could navigate it quickly. I do not like the format.
- It is nearly impossible to get a workable, editable copy of the current Plan of Work or Report of Accomplishments documents that can easily be utilized by our POW/ROA writing teams for editing and entry offline. The PDF/Word/txt versions that are now available are so full of code and text boxes that we have to spend hours and hours converting and editing them before we have something that our writing teams can use without getting completely frustrated. If NIFA could figure out a way to get the documents to download into clean Word documents or fillable PDF forms, I and the POW/ROA writers would rejoice! I'm serious, this is important! It seems like there is an interminable number of clicking back and forth to move around in the software. It was obviously designed by a programmer without much input from testing with end users.
- Does not download properly always, lots of editing of format etc still
- Character limits can be a pain since counts in other applications, such as Word, are sometime inconsistent.
- The back button on the browser does not always work. It is impossible to remember to only use the controls within the software. All online software except for the POW interact with the back button on the browser. Using the back button on the browser logs you out of the planned program. This is highly cumbersome! The layout of the printed report needs considerable improvement. The outcome are presented in a format that is difficult to read. A table with the outcome text, numbers, etc. would be much better!
- Spellcheck not available in the software. The character limit is a huge barrier. During the busiest time of year when the system needs to be utilized, it is not always functional. We can't edit previously entered/approved information (even if the program has been discontinued or conditions have changed).
- my biggest issue relates to being able to access the complete report or POW. we have found ways to do it, but at times our system doesn't be too cooperative with the softward.
- sometimes is difficult to copy the information to the software. Therefore, it takes time to prepare the report.
- I dislike not being able to cut and paste directly from Word into the boxes.
- It would be nice to have the POW that you are reporting against easily accessible to view. It has last year's but not the year before so I have to go somewhere else to get that. This is the first time I am using the system so I have limited knowledge and opinions at this point.
- Narrative space does not allow for adequate discussion of results. Additional space would be beneficial, particularly since we are reporting 3 separate entities: 1890, Experiment Station and Extension Service.
- Content in the system not easily downloaded into formats that could be re-used. It's not bad, just not just useful to our state. I don't think states have been allowed equal input to needs. This survey is a step in the right direction.
- Nothing.
- It does not seem like around the times reports and plans are due that the system is very stable.

- Copying into text boxes is still very clunky. Sometimes it works well and formatting is fine, other times not so much.
- make sure it is tested for glitches several times a day, especially when we are a few weeks before the deadline.
- It takes too long between clicks. Project change needs more work. When a PI wishes to cancel his project early it is impossible to simply go in and change the end date. The system prompts you for the complete input. It is easier to just let it wait until the end date at this point. In reporting the publications, etc it is time consuming to have to enter each publication, media event one at a time. It would be much easier to be able to just cut and paste. Also if there are very many publications to report, the only way we've found to get it to accept multiple is to actually save, exit, log back on and input 10 more. (10 pubs seems to be the magical number that works - anything more than that and you're re-entering those again)
- The software changes some characters, such as quotation marks, into question marks which then have to be corrected.

13. Is there anything about the software that impedes your institutions from reporting high quality data?

Text Response

- Space limitations are sometimes a challenge.
- 3200 character space; only 12 line max in the result section for outcome entries doesn't make for a true description of quality programs.
- The "Reports" module in REEport should be activated to allow us to sort and mine our data.
- It would be helpful to be able to mark a section as "Complete", so you can keep up with which sections you have already done.
- The format of the software is very limiting. the character limitations seem to be rather arbitrary and, in some cases, limit us from including important information. This is going to be especially true now that we have been told that we have to combine our 1890/1862 POWs and ROAs into one report. The outcomes reporting section really is cramped. To adequately describe a program/project outcome given the limitations in the current system is very difficult. I'll be there are numerous states that have a better format for writing impact statements than the one we currently have in the NIFA ROA system.
- Not really but it is time-consuming to deal with a different software system. Seamless integration across software platforms would help.
- In the report development stage, it can be difficult to export previous reports or field information into a form that can be distributed to others for report development. We have several individuals for each program area providing input before the actual report is developed an input into the online system so this is a pretty big challenge.
- The software is not a mature software, so a few bugs and maintenance issues are an issue for us. Invariably, the days we select to enter our data are the same days that the software is down for maintenance!
- Character limit of 3200 is a real barrier. We understand this cannot be unlimited, but it would be helpful to choose selected programs to highlight where they use high quality data beyond 3200 characters. We have tried to reduce the number of planned program areas; therefore, we need additional flexibility to expand the ability to report impacts.
- Research would be better represented if allowed to report independently. Reporting Experiment Station, Extension Service and 1890 under a joint POW dilutes each of our efforts.
- Lack of uniform definitions for terms in the program - from what a direct contact is to what an indirect contact is in our digital educational delivery systems.
- Character limits on some sections but not others.
- No (11)

14. NIFA has used Google Forms for three years; does this positively or negatively affect a state's option to report on any of the indicators?

Text Response

- We find that process to be extremely cumbersome. It seems those same indicators could be listed elsewhere in the software so that they can be filled in, much like the Outputs. Why could each program area not have another page that simply included the indicators for that program area and institutions could supply data for the ones they can report on? These same indicators could be listed in the POW for planning purposes.
- Have not used this myself, so can not answer
- It has a positive effect.
- Don't use it. Never understood what it does. Most of the national indicators don't fit.
- Use the extension excellence website for the annual report
- Neither pos or neg. Google docs make sense to me.
- Easier than older USDA and ARS software.
- I have never used the Google Forms, so it is not applicable to me.
- No. It's not Google Form's that impedes, it's not clearly providing guidance to states about how they might go about collecting the indicator data (e.g., recommended methodology, instruments, etc.). The only ones that I have seen that are close to this are the national 4-H outcome indicators.
- Neutral. All methods have advantages and disadvantages, Google Forms seems OK.
- The format really does not impede nor assist us. Of course, it would be more streamlined to integrate the national outcomes into the software.
- Alabama Cooperative Extension System uses the forms that are provided by NIFA and have not experienced any problems.
- seems to be workable
- It does not make any effect since most everyone use Google, which make it simpler to use.
- don't know. But perhaps it will be more convenient if they are included in the software.
- Doesn't impact it at all that Google Forms have been used instead of a component of the POW software.
- It is positive
- The person who did the report before me said the University does not allow us to enter data with Google forms so we did not participate. We have not been collecting these data but I'm looking to incorporate the "7" into 2016 POW as much as possible. I don't know if the Google forms opinion of predecessor is correct but it is my understanding these 7 will be incorporated into the system itself. I think that is key.
- First, if this is the report titled "NIFA 2014 Impacts Report", we were told this came from a multitude of sources (not limited to only Google Forms). If Google Forms is optional, and the national impacts were pulled from Google Forms, then we are VERY NEGATIVELY affected – NONE of our research will even be considered for inclusion because we have not participated in optional reporting through Google Forms. In addition, now that a National Impacts database has been established, will that become the source for reporting outcomes? What will be the relationship between the National Impacts Database (NID), Google Forms, POW Impacts, and REEport progress reports? This seems to include redundant reporting of some elements.
- Negatively. This basically is a reporting system within a reporting system. It requires that our state has a different process for the general ROA & data reported using the Google Forms. What is up with this?
- Positive
- I do not like using Google Forms. For one, I believe it is extremely unprofessional. Another, as a new user, I cannot even enter the Google Forms without having the data in hand. I like being able to go in and either create a mirrored form for our Extension specialists to use or at least make screenshots. Neither of these are possible within the Google Form as it is currently set up.

- We have yet to report on national outcomes, so I would say it does. Make it an expectation and in the reporting system and it is more likely to get done.
- No impact

15. There are just over 200 disparate data points that make up the national outcomes and indicators; is this too many?

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Yes		27	84%
2	No		5	16%
	Total		32	100%

16. Is it overwhelming to know which ones are or are not important?

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Yes		28	88%
2	No		4	13%
	Total		32	100%

17. Why or why not?

Text Response

- We might get better data if we select fewer indicators to focus on each year. I realize that different institutions may name planned programs differently. Perhaps there could be a box to check to indicate which of the NIFA priority areas the state-defined planned program area most closely relates too, if any. That way the indicators could be mapped back to that planned program area.
- Way too many to know what are the most important aspects to report out on.
- Indicators should provide a variety of options. We know that context matters, people are different, and communities are dynamic. Indicators should be selected based in part on these factors. If we argued that programs are not one size fit all it stands to reason that indicators shouldn't be either. If a program developer and/evaluator purposefully develops and quality program with a sound theory of change indicators are not hard to identify.
- Keep it simple. Their is value in simplicity. We work too hard to please everyone's own programs. Broad goals will work. Let the states decide how to report to them, period.
- Perhaps a smaller number of more general outcomes with the more specific information nested within the general outcomes.
- It would be help to have some way of inticating "Priority" data points.
- If we have a narrow research portfolio wading through all the points can be difficult.
- The aggregated numbers may look impressive on a national scale, but individuals do not make the connection between the local/specific data and the aggregate numbers.
- I'm sure each one of the indicators are important to someone at NIFA (they had better be or they had better be gone).
- "Real" impact gets lost in TMI (too much information).
- When the national indicators were introduced, it was my understanding that they would be significantly pared down so that only the indicators states were actually using would be integrated into the software. It's time to focus on fewer, more meaningful data points.
- Programs are unique and require diverse indicators to provide a unique description of project impacts.
- first question: in our case we have 8 planned programs, which means 25 indicators(and outcomes) for our POW. for us that seems to be pretty large, but perhaps to cover the whole country that many are needed, as there are vast differences among the states. second question: my biggest issue with the outcomes and indicators is that they are not clear and thus not useable. example, under global food security and hunger, ind #2 is number of improved animal genetics. what does that mean? or number of increased efficiencies? those cannot be aggregated across crops, animals, food processes, etc, that make up this planned program. others are more specific and documentable like number of patents issued or number of improved plant varieties released. this is not the idea framework for reporting aggregatable data it seems to me.
- We need to target what we do best.
- I can imagine it is difficult to assess them, since there might be so many different indicators. How to sum them-up to make any sense???
- Said yes but I don't really know if its overwhelming. I am assuming you will have to ponder all data to know if its important or not and I'm not sure who is in charge of doing that.
- It isn't a matter of knowing which are or aren't important, but rather which ones are actually being reported on most frequently and thus, providing more potentially useful data.
- I would rather tell my organization that we have to report against specific outcomes and indicators and then make sure we add them to the statewide survey instruments we are currently designing.
- We are unsure what report/form/database holds the “200 disparate data points” data points, and are unable to provide a response to this question.
- There is little to no clarity regarding: 1. what is important, 2. how what is important is defined, 3. How priority uniform outcomes should be measured and reported.

- By the shear number of indicators, it is hard for many professionals to objectively assess which ones may be the most important and/or most applicable to their program. This is especially hard for young/early career professionals.
- Really? 200?
- too many areas - simplify
- Level of importance varies from state to state

18. Does your state participate in this optional reporting process?

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Yes		18	62%
2	No		11	38%
	Total		29	100%

19. Why not?

Text Response
- It's optional. The indicators don't fit much of what we need to do.
- Insufficient information and manpower to get the information.
- Not required
- Only in this next POW we have projects and indicators phrased similarly to the national ones.
- Actually, we have previously, but not last year due to a loss of staff in our 1890 partner, which required extra assistance from us and we could not compile the data in time to submit.   Even when we do participate, we only report on a very small number of the indicators. Most have to be collected in conjunction with extension and they invested a substantial amount of effort determining what they were going to measure before the national outcomes and indicators were determined. Thus, there hasn't been much interest in revamping their way of doing business in order to better collect things that would feed into the national outcomes.
- The person who did the report before me said the University does not allow us to enter data with Google forms so we did not participate. I'm not sure this is correct and have my hands full doing the report on my own this year so I will not be investigating this or participating this year either to the best of my knowledge.
- Use of Google Forms, as optional, gave us the apparently false understanding that NIFA would not use Google Forms for reporting, as that would leave gaps in the data from which the response would be prepared.   As an optional (not to be used as a sole source because it is incomplete) reporting tool, and because of the additional time required to complete the report, we elected not to participate.Use by NIFA as a sole source for impacts completely ignores our research contribution, and is unacceptable. To use Google Forms as an official reporting tool would require NIFA to meet the Paperwork Reduction Act, requirements, correct? It requires "[With respect to the collection of information and the control of paperwork, each agency shall ...] except as provided under subparagraph (B) or section 3507(j), provide 60-day notice in the Federal Register, and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information, to solicit comment to (i) evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (ii) evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (iii) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (iv) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology".
- We are planning on participating some this year, but from what history I know, it has never been seen as a priority. Plus it was also seen as just additional work.
- We have recently undergone changes to our reporting processes and we put this requirement on the backburner. Anticipate beginning in 2015.

20. Should we change the software to collect these data differently?

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Yes		19	63%
2	No		11	37%
	Total		30	100%

21. How should it be changed?

Text Response
- Many times multiple programs work towards accomplishing one outcome. Ideally, it would be great to be able to combine all of those programs into one outcome report, but because of the space limitations, that is often way too difficult. There could be a button at the bottom of the page that simply says, do you want to enter additional information about another program related to this outcome.
- Don't always have good qualitative data to report out.
- We can easily report multiple impacts from one measure. We make thousands of contacts in many geographical regions with different impacts.
- Should be able to have multiple "stories" or impact statements. I often have go in and create an "unexpected" outcome to enter a decent impact statement.
- More flexibility
- Several specific state outcomes can contribute to a single "success story".
- Let multiple quantitative statements tie to a single qualitative statement.
- The entire report is too inflexible to accurately reflect the impact a program is making in a specific area. For example, if a lab is making a big impact in 3-4 areas, the report cannot handle it due to length constraints.
- 1. Have the ability to select multiple choices from the Outcome Type knowledge/action/condition coice bubbles 2. Have an optional button that will open up a new set of data entry boxes for Issue, What has been done and Results for the same Outcome Target. Allow multiple or unlimited number of Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement entry box sets.
- A more flexible structure to submit impact narratives that don't correspond to a single indicator would be helpful. You could have a limited number of narrative fields optional checkboxes to indicate which outcome indicators relate to the narrative.
- We frequently use the option to enter "unplanned/previously unknown" outcomes every year for nearly every planned program. I believe it is just the nature of the work. New opportunities, policy changes, and environmental changes present themselves every year. I am not sure how to change this, but I whole-heartedly support efforts to streamline the process while providing accurate data.
- allowing for multiple outcomes results
- Perhaps it should be changed to allow more specific portrayal of the problems, activities and impacts achieved in distinct projects.
- I would collect the data on shared indicators from each state separately from the impact statements. Then ask states to provide one impact (with Research and Extension represented) per major program area, predefined. Such as the five NIFA priority work groups, or broader like FCS, Water, Agriculture, etc.   I think the quantitative data as it stands now is fairly meaningless because the outcomes and indicators are not consistent across states.
- Our preference would be to allow for the possibility of a 1:many relationship or a many:1 relationship.
- Allow multiple quantitative indications to be linked to one qualitative impact report & multiple impact reports by quantitative indicators
- There should be a way to connect multiple outcomes to a single impact statement. With that ability, we will have higher quality, richer impact statements.
- multiple efforts and outcomes should be allowed - more flexibility should be implemented.

22. Are there parts of a POW/AR that the states find burdensome to report on?

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Yes		21	68%
2	No		10	32%
	Total		31	100%

23. Why?

Text Response
- Way too much reporting burden for the limited amount of federal funds received from Smith-Lever; for us S-L represents just over 6% of our Extension funding portfolio
- Many states feel they need to provide information on the breadth of the research and extension they complete and to do that adequately makes for a very long report. If a state only reports on a few programs, then it might look like little is being done, by an uninformed observer.
- Forcing all state projects into federal priorities makes reporting artificial
- Too much complexity and variation in the review process.
- Knowledge Areas are difficult to report. Why have Evaluation Results and Key Evaluations Results. It seems like just the Key results should be submitted. How eXtension was used is also difficult to capture accurately.
- Because it seems to be a duplication of the REEport system information.
- Collecting the output and outcome data by multiple PDs means the data are subject to over-reporting and under-reporting. I think the emphasis should be on writing clear impact statements with data the PDs consider relevant.
- The worst is the Planned Program Evaluation section (IV. H.) - It is redundant with the impact Statement section and is really frustrating to figure out exactly what it is we are supposed to include there or how it can be used. And I'm an evaluation specialist! It seems like the information that NIFA seems to use in its reports and summaries only includes certain areas of the information that we are required to provide in the POW/ROA reporting fields. Why do we need to repeat all of what we have already included in the POW when we report to the ROA? Let's just ask for what will be used. It seems like somebody has said, "Hey, let;s use the logic model when we ask them for information, but only use certain parts of the model for the information we need." I love logic models, but not just for the sake of building logic models. That is one of the issues we always have that frustrates our research faculty. They don't understand logic models, they don't want to understand logic models.
- Focus on specific program impact, eliminate all else
- i say burdensome because of the sheer volume of the report. with our 8 planned programs , some with 10 or more state defined outcomes, the volume of the report (time to prepare and pages) is pretty signficant. with that said, NC has never looked at the POW and accomp report as discretionary (other than stakeholder and merit review). we have always taken this as a serious responsibility and we've gotten it done.
- On the research side it is difficult for faculty to report impact in changing conditions as an outcome of their individual projects. There's a delay between research and problem solution and somehow it is difficult to portray progress in the program even though individual projects have met their goals and advanced knowledge towards a solution.
- Many of the components, like the distribution of activities across KAs, expenditures by program area, numbers of publications, etc., require days of manually compiling data from CRIS and the financial report (formerly AD-419s) and then dividing components across the planned programs. And without confidence that we will be able to generate the same reports in REEport that we could in CRIS, it could become even more time consuming in the future, perhaps even requiring institutions to keep a shadow system that contains the pertinent information for each federal research project that could be easily queried.
- Evaluation of multi joint activities
- At least how our report is currently set up. I am working to streamline this to fewer programs and one or two impacts per program. I think if everyone reported against a few specific program areas and indicators and concentrated on those it would be way more useful. The executive summary can be shared between AR and POW, if it is even needed at all. If we could have NIFA mine the landgrantimpacts.org and not have to replicate efforts that would be ideal. To do both makes no sense and I have our communications team working in landgrantimpacts.org and adding impacts all year long...much more manageable and effective than the once a year POW system that I would not want to give them access to.
- Duplicate or similar data is reported in multiple reporting formats: REEport, POW, RA, Google Forms, NID, etc. and is ineffective for states

to continually report in slightly different forms that same data. Reducing the report requirements to only Stakeholder input and Merit Review required by NIFA could be simpler, depending on what NIFA would require under these two areas.
- Redundancy.
- It is extremely time consuming to report at the current level. Drop it down to the two required things and State Defined outcomes. That's enough.
- I think state stakeholders should have some input into the process - advisory councils to review the POW and Progress.
- some of the information is repetitious

24. Would you support minimal reporting standards that could be normalized across states (a core reporting template) and focused only on the AREERA reporting areas which are legislatively mandated?

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Yes		23	77%
2	No		7	23%
	Total		30	100%

25. If you have you ever had a report NOT approved what was the deficiency?

Text Response

- NO (4)
- We have never had a report not approved
- We have had several Hatch annual and final report returned for revision. This has most often be due to confusion and not the quality or quantity of the research. We have not had a report just rejected.
- The Alabama Cooperative Extension System has never had a deficiency where the report was not approved.
- to the above question: yes, maybe. it's hard to answer that without knowing what it looks like. to this question: we had our supplemental OGFM form returned last year because we failed to include $15,000 multistate research allocation in our total hatch allocation. we fixed that and it was accepted. otherwise, POW and accomp report have always been accepted on first review after submission.
- all have been eventually approved. Once we were told that we needed to include a Childhood Obesity program, even though we had no faculty or project in this area on the research side, but then told us that it was OK to create the program in the software and leave everything blank after justifying why we were doing it. So we created an empty Childhood Obesity program.
- To the best of my knowledge we have not had this happen.
- We have not had a report disapproved.
- This question doesn't make any sense. All our state reports have been approved.
- Never have since I have been responsible (10+ years).

26. Who handles these reporting functions at your institutions?

Text Response

- A faculty member in our Organizational Development Unit
- Diane Craig
- Associate department heads
- faculty and staff ->teams -> Assistant Directors of OCES and OAES
- Team
- Joint effort between program teams; assistant directors; state leader for eval, program planning head, associate directors, director and 1890 administrator
- An Accoutability Specialist
- Research: College of Ag Associate Dean for Research; Extension: Associate Director
- Accountability Analyst
- AES and CES administrators mand accountants
- Two [people are primarily repsonsible, but we have writing teams that collect date and write the draft narratives.
- Our administrators, program leaders, select research and extension faculty and faculty in our Program and Staff Development Department
- Faculty, Dept Heads, Associate Directors, Assessment Staff
- Program staff development, program leaders/department heads, selected faculty and staff
- For Extension - Dr. Joseph Donaldson, Assistant Professor of Program Development and Evaluation
- System Program Team, Business Office, Administration, priority program teams
- ncars special projects manager and team
- Scott Cummings
- Extension Planning Office and Exp. Station Research Assoc.
- Assistant Dean for Research, Faculty acting as Program Coordinators (Research side); Planning Division Director and federal program contacts (Extension side)
- The Associate Director of the AES and the Director of Extension Program and Staff Development
- Extension Specialists
- me, research analyst in Pgm Dev and Eval Ctr
- 2 ES staff (Asst/Assoc Dirs), 4 CES (program staff and the asst to dir), and 2 1890 staff at a minimum
- Program & Staff Development, Financial Services & IT Departments
- Program Leaders, program area writers, Program & Staff Development staff
- Director of Planning and Reporting and Associate Directors in Extension and research
- administrative team
- Director of Program & Staff Development,
- Several different people
- Team leaders report to Associate Directors
- The Associate Director

27. How many people are involved?

Text Response
25
1.5
8 to 10
30 (3)
10
47
?
>5
1 (2)
5
30+ (2)
100+
150
8
3
17
2 (2)
13
lots
8 plus data contributors
9
6
17+
21
4

28. What is your best estimate of the people hours dedicated to the POW and AR on an annual basis?

Text Response
300 (2)
150
125
500 (2)
Too many
200
?
50
120 (3)
40
4000
160
4,000 hrs. plus
1,000
150 per person
More than 200 for editing contacts; much less for the others.
170
no idea
100 for the Exp Station
12,000
400
175 man hours
over 100 hrs
100-120

29. To what extent are your partner 1890 institutions engaged with you in this process?

#	Answer		Response	%
1	None		6	19%
2	Little		6	19%
3	Some		12	39%
4	A Lot		7	23%
	Total		31	100%

30. How does or should NIFA reporting relate to other reporting processes?

Text Response

- There appears to be a lot of duplication of reporting. Could the POW and Reporting process be somehow linked with the ECOP Impact Database and the Excellence in Extension database to pre-fill some fields?
- Needs to be streamlined
- Most of our NIFA Extension reporting is also reported in our state state strategic plan
- We should not be asked to send in outcome and impact information in the report and then asked to again send it into a national data base then be asked by head of NIFA to have them directly sent to him, etc. Does anybody look at the information in the Annual Report after we send in and the NPLs review? Is that information too hard to pull out? Then make a different entry system.
- Forcing combined 1862 and 1890 reports makes it difficult to id the contributions of smaller institutions
- Should be one report for research and one for extension; the combined report and plans are excessively long and boring!
- Seems to be very similar in the information entered into REEport so it is duplicative for Hatch funds
- I do not see any relationship. We do not use the data we collect for NIFA because it is so generic and aggregated. Our stakeholders do not ask for these data or reports.
- I'm not aware that it relates to any other reporting processes that we do. The formats of the NIFA POW/ROA are not aligned with other reporting processes that we do.
- Seems to be a lot of duplication
- Most of the data that goes into NIFA reports is needed for other reporting purposes for county, state, or institutional stakeholders.
- Alabama Cooperative Extension System has created a planning and reporting process that is consistent with the federal reporting and planning process.
- on that last question: our 1890 institution feeds data and narrative to our reporting team for inclusion in our combined report. they will normally input their own POW information as well as their own FTE and expenditures data for the accomp report. one this question: 1. as stated before, the NIFA reporting meshes nicely with our institution's faculty activity reporting schedule; those FARs help inform our NIFA reporting process 2. our NIFA reporting process provides us information for use when the state legislature is in session; it also is the primary information base used for the research section of our annual report to our chancellor. 3. and many other times during the year, we point to information and data in the annual NIFA report to respond to many different requests for achievements and impacts of our research and extension programs.
- None
- I don't know enough about the other processes but I have never understood why we are reporting on research when the CRIS (now REEport) had much of this information in it.
- Eliminate duplication (impact statements, accomplishments, quantitative measures like funding, FTE, etc.) requested in multiple data sources such as REEport, NID, POW, ROA, Google Forms, etc.
- The NIFA ROA structure is fine; the REEport & ROA duplication is outdated & a waste of taxpayer money.
- On the federal level, NIFA reporting should be tied into or combined with other requests, such as the Excellence in Extension report.
- They should all be tied together and complement each other without undue duplication.
- most of it is unique to NIFA - some is used within the state for impacts
- Much more involved, but it also encompasses a lot more.

31. How does your institution use the POW and/or AR?

Text Response

- Quite frankly, we don't. We have other institutional tools we use to report to stakeholders that better fit our needs. We complete the POW and the AR simply because we have to.
- It does not use the NIFA report.
- We use our internal reporting and our state strategic plan to create the POW and annual report.
- We often use the outcome and impact information. It is rewritten and used in our outreach magazine, on radio and tv spots, in presentations to university administration, legislators, interest groups, constituents, etc. We use some of the quantitative data as well.
- Very little
- We use the software to guide program planning and reporting. Our program teams are continuously in discussion about the POW and AR. In Alabama we do not wait until reporting time to think about reporting. Our teams collect data throughout the program year, provide mid year updates, and participate in training in preparation for the POW and AR. Each year we meet with teams to share feedback from the NIFA reviewer and work really hard to make adjusts based on his/her comments. The State Leader for Evaluation uses the POW and AR as capacity building opportunities for program development faculty and staff.
- We often use the information in our reports to the state and our administrations. AR's are use in evaluating individual departments.
- This information is not used in any other area of our reporting. We only complete the POW and AR for NIFA reporting.
- Sometimes it is used to show what we are required to be doing with our funds as a justification to the central administration of the institution.
- We currently do not use it. The POWROA is never referred to after it is submitted. It is irrelevant to the faculty, staff and administration.
- In my function, I'm not aware that we use it for anything, except to submit it to NIFA as required and we post the ROA document onto our website.
- POW helps identify key areas of need and trends We use only the impact statements from the report to tell our story.
- Although we try to link it with our strategic plan and state annual reports, most employees are unaware the POW and AR even exist.
- We do not use these reports. The format is just too clunky. However, we have a very strong state reporting system based in part on the NIFA framework. It has been a very good thing for us. Our reporting system seems much more user-friendly and takes advantage of Web 2.0 tools in a robust way.
- Alabama Cooperative Extension System uses it to report to multiple stakeholders. We use the reviewers' comments for continuous improvement in program planning and reporting. Federal, state and county priorities are linked through this process.
- see above
- Is the basis for programming.
- It is not used much but sometimes executive presentations are based on its results and use its structure of programs.
- The POW process is used as a planning tool for periodic evaluation and rethinking of programs more on the extension side than for research. Some of the data and metrics collected for the AR are used in other reports to the state and institution.
- For planning and evaluation.
- We don't.
- Used only to satisfy the NIFA reporting requirement. Indirectly, it is used to ensure receipt of our federal funds.
- To meet NIFA requirements.
- The POW drives the content of our Extension reporting system. Program leaders utilize the POW to identify what indicators should be included. The AR is published for internal use, but not beyond that. Our communications department utilizes the AR in creating marketing pieces for Extension and Research.
- Because we go through this process, it does help to drive us towards an accountability on outcomes/impacts that might not be as strong otherwise.

- see above Used for in-state accountability
- As an accountability tool to inform our system that their info is critical and is being utilized
- AR's are used as collective data for the department reviews as well as faculty's review.
- As a relatively new person in this position, I don't know how it is used at the institution level. As a former department head, we did not use the report at all.
- for work plans and reporting to university system

32. What value does this process add to your organization?

Text Response

- It does require us to push our faculty to complete periodic program evaluations to collect data to support the AR. We would do it anyway, but this report sets the the date for us to do it.
- No value
- It helps focus impacts into some manageable bullet points.
- It does add value. I think it could be less cumbersome and we could still get much of the value and the costs would be lower.
- Collects impact statements
- We are better able to plan for programs and data usage.
- Actually, not much. The success stories in both extension and research are the most important. Metrics such as # of publications, etc., are captured in other ways for faculty evaluations.
- None
- It emphasizes the partnership with USDA-NIFA and show how important the funds we receive form them are and how it leverages local funds.
- Right now, it only adds frustration to the people who are in the process.
- I'm not aware of any value to the POW/ROA process except to get Federal funds.
- NIFA POW and ROA have limited value State POW and Impact Statements have significant value
- As someone involved in the process, it has given me an opportunity to see the range and magnitude of work being performed in our state and understand how things are viewed at the national level. The faculty and administrators involved who take the process seriously are more knowledgeable about what is being done and better equipped to provide direction to faculty and staff. Unfortunately, there are others who simply provide the easy information and check it off their to-do list without any thought or follow up at the program level.
- Again, we have a very strong state reporting system based in part on the NIFA framework.
- We have one plan of work and reporting process.
- helps us communicate the impacts and value of research and extension programs to many and varied stakeholders and collaborators.
- Streamline the State plan of work and stress stakeholder involvement in both planning and accomplishments.
- It forces everyone to reflect yearly on what's being done and make adjustments.
- It is probably not adding much value to the research side, but I think my extension colleague would say it assists in organizing their programs and reporting.
- Demonstrate our accomplishment to other institutions
- It gets us to report impacts but we are getting that pressure elsewhere anyways.
- Minimal if at all.
- None.
- It does create that review process for us. Allows for a critical look at what we expected to do in our programs in the POW and what happened, which then influences the creation of the next POW.
- Limited value.
- The Research project process (POW / AR) is essential to the research portfolio of the institution. This guide faculty and keeps work on track - It also allows for accountability
- A lot

33. Are there any specific aspects which are particularly valuable or alternately lacking in value?

Text Response
- Information as is, is not useful for how we'd need to use it
- KAs, state defined outputs, activity, merit review and stakeholder input provide little we did not already know about our institution. Collecting this and entering it add little and we seldom use as collected for this document.
- The output and outcome sections are extremely helpful in creating reports for various stakeholders. In Alabama we use the data collected for our AR to tell out state and local story as well as highlight stakeholder specific impacts.
- The general areas of work are useful, but as the POW or AR gets more specific, it also becomes less useful. The most difficult aspect is the FTE estimate. Faculty have very different approaches to making this estimate. There is often a huge difference between faculty reported FTE's and budgeted FTE's.
- No
- I cannot find anything of value in the reports other than fulfilling a requirement. This has become a checklist item that everyone at our institution dreads. Occasionally we find an emerging project that we can highlight in other reports, but that is rare and certainly not worth the effort.
- Getting our Federal dollars is valuable. The frustration in trying to figure out the information needs, how we might use the information in other venues and working in the processes current format are what's lacking value.
- Process is too cumbersome Value may be in working with 1890 and other institutions regionally
- Because we have one POW and reporting process, it allows for our data to be streamlined and easily accessed for multiple reporting needs.
- The process I believe is more valuable than the actual results which are perhaps better portrayed in other type of reports.
- Requiring the single state report has made me more aware of the programs at our partner 1890 institution.
- Very little value.
- It has helped our faculty consider ROI. The structure based on the logic model supports consideration of our strategy & program theory.
- It is a worthwhile process to seek the outcomes of our efforts. Would we do this without the NBIFA reporting system? I think we would.
- Very Valuable

34. Please describe any other problems or concerns and suggestions for improvements relative to the POW or AR.

Text Response
- We receive only about 14% of our funding from federal sources, yet this report takes an inordinate amount of faculty time and resources to complete. It seems that the reporting could be streamlined to reflect the small percentage of the total budget. I would really like to know how much of this info is actually used by NIFA.
- Minimize, streamline data reporting requirements.
- For us, the coordination among universities can be difficult. It wouuld be easier for all concerned if the individual Hatch, Evans-Allen, etc. AR's were used by NIFA to generate the state AR metrics.
- Just the issue of duplication of information between this and REEport.
- I do not know what a good report looks like. I do not know what a bad report looks like. If this is a pass/fail report, you are doomed to receive a lot D- reports. If you can show me what an A+ report looks like and reward me for providing a great report, then I can give it to you.
- I would encourage NIFA to include more input and feedback loops in the system, on an ongoing basis, from individuals who are researchers, extension educators and program evaluators. It seems like NIFA thinks this is more of a "business office" or IT function more than a research project/extension education driven function. I think that is why we often get frustrated and confused by the processes.
- Suggestions Downsize POW formatting, streamline, connect better to reporting, improve software user-friendliness Focus on impact reporting only in Reeport, focus on one report for research and extension, reduce duplication of reporting
- There are too many knowledge areas (KA). The process of splicing data to the level of the definitions is extremely difficult and as a result the accuracy is debatable. From my understanding it creates problems at the national level as well because there is wide inconsistency in how information at the KA level is reported from state to state. It does not accurately reflect the work being done.
- Flexibility to remove programs that have been discontinued. Flexibility to increase the number of character spaces on selected programs.
- I say lots of people work on the report but basically it is me collecting information from others, manipulating it into the appropriate POW/AR categories, and putting it into the report. I do the Extension contacts but collect research $, patents and licensing, publications from others. This is most time consuming for the publications (research and librarian). Teams of faculty are asked to produce the impact statements and then I or our communications staff rewrite them to meet needs of Landgrantimpacts.org and/or AREERA. Florida A&M also contributes time collecting data for the report and I coordinate with them. I think the OMB forms are confusing and not sure why they have to tie directly into the planned programs. If we could just have KAs for Research and broad and specific program areas for Extension each year (or we could map to KAs) I think this would make it much simpler. I'm not sure why I have to project out five years - it is totally a guess.
- None to note here.
- Have one system that states can mine.   If NIFI had a live database then there could be an annual deadline for data entry, but no "report."

35. Please indicate which position type most closely defines yours.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Extension Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director		9	28%
2	Experiment Station Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director		8	25%
3	Extension or Experiment Station Business Officer or other position in Business Office		0	0%
4	Evaluation Specialist		6	19%
5	Administrative Assistant in Director's Office		2	6%
6	Other		7	22%
	Total		32	100%

Other
State Leader for Evaluation
Accountability expert
Mid-Level Administration
Faculty
special projects manager, experiment station
research analyst
Director, Program & Staff Dev