

Appendix D. EFNEP Burden Calculations

The burden for respondents was estimated through feedback from a survey sent to 13 EFNEP Coordinators and their data managers. All tiers (funding levels) and NIFA geographic regions, were represented, as were 1862, 1890 and insular area institutions. Ten surveys were returned; nine contained aggregatable data.

Total Estimated Burden - Hours

Collection Activity	Number of Respondents	Estimated Hours per response	Total Annual Burden Hours
EFNEP	76	1,060	80,564

Regional and Institution level figures (below) were added together to determine the total annual burden hours (80,563.7) and divided by the total number of respondents (76) to estimate the number of burden hours per response (1,060.1).

Regional Burden Calculations - Minutes

To calculate the regional burden, each university responded to a survey with data on the total number of minutes it took regional (i.e. county) users to enter one adult graduate (including demographic entry and exit data, food recalls, and behavior questionnaires), one adult non-graduate (demographics only), one youth group (demographic entry and exit data) and one youth individual (behavior questionnaire). The responses from each university were averaged together and then multiplied by the total number of adult graduates, adult non-graduates, youth groups, and youth individuals in the FY2018 Federal Data set.

	Adult Grad	Adult Non-Grad	Youth Group	Youth Individual
Average of Reported Values (minutes)	39.7	6.6	24.1	6.1
Multiplier	61,845 Adult Grads (FY18)	28,480 Adult Non-Grads (FY18)	14,395 Youth Groups (FY18)	274,742 (youth individuals (FY18)
Burden (minutes)	2,455,246.5	187,968.0	346,919.5	1,675,926.2

TOTAL REGIONAL BURDEN HOURS = 4,666,060.2 minutes / 60 minutes = 77,767.7 hours

Institutional Burden Calculations - Minutes

Since institutions (i.e. universities) are responsible for ensuring that staff data (all staff as opposed to one staff member) is current and correct, staff calculations were incorporated into the institutional staff

review data calculations. The survey also collected the total number of minutes it took institution level users to review the data, submit the data, prepare the program plan, submit the program plan, prepare the budget, and submit the budget. These values were averaged and multiplied out by the total number of reporting institutions given that there is one submission per institution.

	Data Review	Data Submission	Plan Prep	Plan Submission	Budget Prep	Budget Submission
Average of Reported Values (minutes)	788.3	71.1	740.0	65.1	510.0	32.9
Multiplier	76 universities	76 universities	76 universities	76 universities	76 universities	76 universities
Burden (minutes)	59,910.8	5,403.6	56,240.0	4,947.6	38,760.0	2,500.4

*Central State University became eligible for EFNEP in 2016, resulting in 76 institutions now conducting EFNEP.

TOTAL INSTITUTION BURDEN HOURS = 167,762.4 minutes / 60 minutes = 2,796.0 hours

Difference in what was submitted in the current OMB approval package and previous OMB approval packages

This data reveals that WebNEERS' overall time burden for grantees decreased by 6,262 hours, or an average of 83 hours per institution from the previous reporting period. This is impressive. NIFA has given increased attention in recent years to improving programming through data, plans, and budgets submitted through WebNEERS. During FY 2017 and FY 2018 in particular, training and technical assistance were given to help universities provide more complete and accurate data, plans, and budgets. Further, prior to 2015, not all universities were reporting behavioral change for youth. That policy was changed to ensure more complete and accurate reporting, and better use of the data to guide programming nationally and within states. Universities clearly find value in the data collected through WebNEERS and are using WebNEERS to benefit program participants and guide programming, as intended (see Appendix B – WebNEERS use by states and counties). With the ongoing development of WebNEERS, universities continue to save time and money.

Difference in what was submitted for the Federal Register and burden reported in this justification

When the Federal Register announcement was due, raw data and calculations from the previous OMB approval package could not be found. Staff who had developed the previous calculation process had left the agency. This critical information was not available.

To meet deadlines, an alternate methodology was developed and used for the regional data burden estimate, using technology to determine time stamp averages. All FY 2018 records were analyzed to identify those which involved a time lapse representing data entry and submission. Periodic samples (every 10,000 records) were then used to calculate the average length of time for each type of record. Averages were multiplied by the total number of records to get the final estimate. That methodology was more accurate than estimates provided in this package in that it averaged the submission time of all data, and then sampled every 10,000th record. However, it was less complete in that it only was able to

capture the time burden for staff as they were entering data into WebNEERS. It did not capture the additional time universities spent, gathering, cleaning, and reviewing the data.

For the Federal Register institutional burden estimate, calculations were based on a previous survey sent by Clemson University to nine EFNEP Coordinators and their data managers, since the type of data collected remained unchanged and since a time stamp process could not be used to determine those calculations. Seven institutions responded. All extension regions (geographic locations) and tiers (level of funding) were represented. Insular areas, which have technology infrastructure challenges were also represented.

A continued search resulted in finding the previously used process following release of the announcement in the Federal Register. That process, which had formerly been used, was used again, and is reported here. As noted, it represents a more complete and current depiction of the burden than what could be retrieved and determined for the Federal Register notice. It is also more in line with previous burden estimates.