

**From:** Fronczek, Lisa Jean (Fed) <lisa.fronczek@nist.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 7, 2021 6:22 PM  
**To:** PRAComments <PRAComments@doc.gov>  
**Subject:** Reference: Research Performance Progress Report (RPPR) - OMB Control Number 0690-0032

Ms Dumas,

<p><b>25. What was accomplished under these goals?</b></p> <p>Task 1:          1. Developed and tracked key performance indicators for the project Design &amp; Product Innovation          - Approved Designs, 62 with a goal of 70          - Product Types in Portfolio, 7 with a goal of 6          Supply Capabilities          - Manufacturing Capabilities, 6 with a goal of 6          - Manufacturing Capacity, 268,000 with a goal of 300,000          - Manufacturing Supply Network, 487 with a goal of 500          - Focus Region Supply, NC (9 with a goal of 10), AZ (7 with a goal of 10), OH (89 with a goal 90)          Demand Fulfillment          - Number of end users requesting products on NIH 3D Print Exchange, 209,000 with a goal of 80,000          - Number of end users requesting products through America Makes Portal, 81 with a goal of 100</p> <p>2. Finalized a needs protocol and guidance document</p> <p>3. Drafted and finalized AMCFPR Registration/SME Roadmap, and presented Roadmap to NIST representatives</p> <p>4. Collaborated with representatives from the NIST Coordination Group on program involving other organizations (CDC, FDA, VA) on a consolidated plan for PPE needs.</p> <p>Task 2:          America Makes/Education and Workforce Development (EMWD) Team</p> <p><b>26. What opportunities for training and professional development has the project provided?</b></p>
--

As a Federal Program Officer, I see completed Research Performance Progress Reports (RPPR, OMB Control

Number 0690-0032) several times a year. While the form is useful in letting awardees what type of information that is important to submit, it is NOT formatted to be user-friendly either for the project team who needs to enter in the information or for the Federal Program Officer who needs to review the form. Please consider making these changes when the new form is issued:

- 1) Issuing the form either as a word-processing document (e.g., Microsoft Word) and a PDF. When designing the PDF make the fields both expand to fit the full contents of the information not just scroll to see the extra information. If it is only set to scroll, it is not possible to print the document for the files and still read the information.

**Image:** In this example, the awardee provided detailed accomplishment information; however, on the top 22 lines of their response is shown. Another 25 lines appear if you click on the form and scroll down. Of course, this text can only be read when I copy and pasted this into another application. Printing the document is a what you see is what you get... meaning if you can't see the text without scroll, you can't see it on the paper either.

- 2) It would also be nice to have a consistent font size through the document.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR/PROJECT DIRECTOR	
6. Last Name and Suffix: De [redacted]	7. First and Middle Name: Emily
8. Title: Sr. Advisor, Education and Workforce	
9. Email: ede [redacted]@gmail.com	10. Phone Number: 202 508 0405

**Image:** Showing the different font sizes. Notice how the person's name is small, yet the person's title is

double that size. This also occurs in the Authorizing Official section.

RPPR is meant to be used to document research accomplishments yet the fields do not allow for much information. The current form discourages awards from providing useful information. For example, If the awardee enters in more than the field is sized for the font continues to get smaller and smaller.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS
<p><b>24. What were the major goals and objectives of this project?</b></p> <p>The overall project objective is to pilot the Operation Next curriculum with incumbent and dislocated workers impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic in two regional economies (Pittsburgh and Detroit). By the end of the project period, 250 individuals will have enrolled in and/or completed one or more of the Operation Next courses and, as appropriate, earned standards-based, nationally portable, industry-recognized credentials.</p>
<p><b>25. What was accomplished under these goals?</b></p> <p><small>This report covers activity from October 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021. We have been focused in other primary areas during this time.</small></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identifying, engaging, and readying the performance-based learning providers in each regional economy.</li> <li>2. In Pittsburgh, agreements were put in place with the Community College of Allegheny County, New Century Careers, and Pittsburgh Technical College.</li> <li>3. In Detroit, the LIFT Learning Lab, Macomb Community College, and Henry Ford Community College have been engaged to provide the performance-based learning activities.</li> <li>2. Marketing and promoting the training opportunity in the regions. Regional partners are using a variety of methods to "get the word" out about the training opportunity to both individuals and to area SMMAs. Methods include:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Emails to SMM partners and members.</li> <li>b. Social media advertising.</li> <li>c. "Traditional" media spots (TV, etc.).</li> <li>d. Group presentations.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Partnership with the workforce development and unemployment systems.</li> <li>3. Enrolling students in the training and supporting their training journey.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. In Detroit, 26 individuals are currently in training. (9 in CNC and 17 in welding). There are an additional 24 enrollments in progress.</li> <li>b. In Pittsburgh, 34 people are currently in training. (14 in welding, 16 in CNC and 4 in ITM). 3 individuals have already received credentials and 2 more are in the enrollment process.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

**Image:** Notice the actual size of the text. The information in field 24 can be read with the naked eye; however, the information in field 25 can only be read if I open it if the page is

zoomed in several times. This issue is not limited to Field 25 but is prevalent through the form.

PARTICIPANTS & OTHER COLLABORATING ORGANIZATIONS
<p><b>33. What individuals have worked on this project?</b></p> <p>Emily Dallano, PhD            Brian Pickett, LIFT            Joseph Mackenzy, LIFT            Marlene Demingue, LIFT            Kevin Kiergan, LIFT            Shawn Davis, LIFT            Petra Mitchell, Catalyst Connection            Wade Pridem, Catalyst Connection            Michele Unruh, Workforce Intelligence Network            Sarah Gregory, Workforce Intelligence Network</p>
<p><b>34. Has there been a change in the active other support of the PD/PI(s) or senior/key personnel since the last</b></p>

**Image:** Another example. Just 10 names is too much for field 33.

N/A	
31. Inventions, patent applications, and/or licenses	
N/A	
32. Other products	
N/A	

**Image:** Notice that the same response "N/A" is shown on two different

fields in different sizes!

I understand and appreciate the rationale behind creating the form. I support the idea to standardize the information requested from awardees. I want to make it easy for the awardees to enter information and review it before submitting it to us. I'm just encouraging you to not only consider what information should be captured under the Paperwork Reduction Act but to also consider how the form will be implemented. Please ask the DOC grants IT team to test the new form with a lot of data not just a few letters which tests the navigation through the form. If you have specific questions or would like to test the new form, I would be glad to engage with the form designers.

Sincerely,  
 Lisa Fronczek

Lisa Jean Fronczek  
 Office of Advanced Manufacturing/Advanced Manufacturing National Program Office  
 National Institute of Standards and Technology  
 O: 301-975-6633  
[lfronczek@nist.gov](mailto:lfronczek@nist.gov)