

The objective of this survey is to gather feedback related to your award* experience with NOAA's [INSERT COMPETITION NAME], including the quality of the assistance offered by [Insert Program Name]. This survey will also assess your thoughts on various aspects of the research to operations, applications, commercialization or other uses (R2X). Your feedback will help us improve our customer service and R2X processes.

If you have any questions or concerns, please email [INSERT PROGRAM EMAIL].

*In this survey, "award" refers to both grants and cooperative agreements.

Public Burden Statement

A Federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, nor shall a person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with an information collection subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 unless the information collection has a currently valid OMB Control Number. The approved OMB Control Number for this information collection is 0690-0030. Without this approval, we could not conduct this survey. Public reporting for this information collection is estimated to be approximately 10-20 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the information collection. All responses to this information collection are voluntary. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this information collection, including suggestions for reducing this burden to the [enter contact name and email].

The following questions will be asked on all surveys.

1. What is your affiliation?

- Individual
- Academia
 - Large research university (i.e., Doctoral, Masters, and Professional Colleges & Universities)
 - Primarily undergraduate institution
 - Minority serving institution (i.e., a Tribal College or University, an Historically Black College or University, or an Hispanic-Serving Institution.)
 - Community college
 - Technical institute
- Business/industry
 - Private sector organization or company
 - Community-based organization (CBO)
 - Non-profit/Non-governmental organization

- State/local government
- Tribal Government
- NOAA Cooperative Institute
- NOAA Cooperative Science Center
- Other _____

2. Where are you located?

Drop-down of all US States and territories provided

3. What stage are you in your career?

- Student
- Early career (0-10 years)
- Mid-career (11-20 years)
- Late career (21+ years)
- Retired
- Other _

4. How did you find out about the NOAA [Program Office] Funding Opportunity?

- Program website
- Program blog
- Program social media account
- Other NOAA website
- Program Regional Coordinator email or newsletter
- From another Federal agency
- From a colleague
- Other: _____

5. What competition did you apply for?

- [will provide a list of available competitions]

6. What was the title of your proposal?

7. How many working hours did it take to prepare and submit your most recent full proposal, including all aspects of the proposal writing and submission process? *If multiple people contributed to preparing and submitting the award, please provide your best estimate for the total amount of time spent by all contributors combined.*

8. What products/resources were most helpful to you in the development of your application? (select all that apply)

- Instructions/guidelines provided by Grants.gov
- Notice of Funding Opportunity document or FAQ document

- Applicant Checklist
- NOAA Funding Opportunities webpage
- FY21 Research Notice of Funding Opportunity Reference List
- Letter of Intent Template
- Title Page Template
- Abstract Template
- Data Management Plan Guidance and Sample
- Budget Narrative Guidance document
- Federal Form SF-424A How-to-Guide
- Behavior Change Guidance document
- NOAA Marine Debris Program Regional Coordinator
- NOAA Marine Debris Program Grant Officers (Tom Barry or Amanda Dwyer)
- NOAA Marine Debris Program grant writing workshop
- Other _____

9. If applicable, what was the biggest challenge you experienced in applying for funding through the NOAA [Program]? (e.g., navigating grants.gov, securing match funding, time required, etc.)

10. How many federal grants have you applied to before this one?

- 0
- 1-3
- 4-7
- 8 or more

11. Of the federal grants applied to, how many were funded?

- 0
- 1-3
- 4-7
- 8 or more

12. Has your organization applied for a funding opportunity with the NOAA [Program] prior to (add year)?

- Yes
- No

If you answered "No" to question 12, proceed to question 14.

13. Has your organization been funded by a NOAA [Program] grant prior to (add year)? (select all that apply)

- No
- I'm not sure
- Yes (Will provide multiple choice list with relevant past competitions.)

14. Did you attend/view the recording of the [Program]-hosted applicant webinar for the competition you applied to?

- Yes—I watched the webinar live.
- Yes—I watched the recorded webinar on my own time.
- No—I did NOT watch the webinar.
- I did not know a webinar about the FYXX NOFO existed.

15. Thinking about your experience watching this year's NOFO webinar, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly disagree*.

- I found the webinar helpful when preparing my application materials.
- I gained new knowledge about WPO's funding opportunities from the webinar.
- The webinar addressed questions I had about WPO's funding opportunities.

16. If no, what prevented you from attending/reviewing the webinar?

17. Do you have suggestions on how the [Program] can improve the resources it provides to new or returning applicants? (select all that apply)

- Applicant webinar
- Grant writing workshops
- Notice of Funding Opportunity overview guide/summary
- Streamlined Notice of Funding Opportunity
- How to apply guide
- Sample application/template
- FAQs
- Other _____

18. Do you have any additional suggestions on how to improve the application process?

19. Did you submit a Letter of Intent (LOI)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

20. Based on your Letter of Intent, were you encouraged to submit a full proposal?

- ☐ Yes

- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially - my LOI was found to be “partially responsive” to the [program] call for proposals
- ☐ N/A - did not submit a Letter of Intent

21. If you did not submit a Letter of Intent, what was the main reason for not submitting one?

- I did not know what a LOI was.
- I was not aware that I could submit a LOI before submitting my full proposal.
- I did not have enough time to submit a LOI.
- I did not know about this funding opportunity until after the LOI due date.
- It was not required, so I intentionally chose not to submit a LOI even though I had enough time.
- Other? [Please specify]

22. [If Yes to Q20] Please estimate the amount of time (rounded to the nearest hour) that you spent preparing your Letter of Intent (LOI).

23. [If Yes to Q20] [Program Office] uses both a Smartsheet form and email submission to collect Letters of Intent. Thinking about your experience using the Smartsheet form to submit your Letter of Intent, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*. If you did not submit via Smartsheet Form, please choose that option.

- ☐ It was easy to use the Smartsheet form to submit my Letter of Intent.
- ☐ The Smartsheet form was clear and easy to understand.
- ☐ I would prefer submitting my Letter of Intent via email in the future.

24. If your Letter of Intent was found to be “partially responsive” to the [program] call for proposals, did you submit a full proposal?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ N/A

25. If you answered “No” to question 13, why did you not submit a full proposal?

26. Did you find the feedback in the response to your Letter of Intent helpful in preparing a full proposal? Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

- I received constructive feedback that helped improve my proposal.
- The feedback I received was clear and easy to understand.
- I received feedback in a timely manner.

27. The Program Office wants to better understand the optimal amount of time that applicants need to prepare a Letter of Intent. Therefore, in your opinion, how many weeks are needed to sufficiently prepare a Letter of Intent?

- Less than one week
- 1 week
- 2 weeks
- 3 weeks
- 4 weeks
- 5 weeks
- 6 weeks
- More than 6 weeks

28. The Program Office wants to better understand the optimal amount of time that applicants need to prepare their full proposal using Letter of Intent feedback. Therefore, in your opinion, how many weeks are needed to sufficiently prepare your full proposal using Letter of Intent feedback?

- One week or less
- 2 weeks
- 3 weeks
- 4 weeks
- 5 weeks
- 6 weeks
- More than 6 weeks

Questions re Project Outcomes and Implementation

1. Could you please provide some background on your organization's role in the [project name] and your role with respect to that?
2. From your perspective, what would "success" look like at the end of your [part of the] project? Are there key elements about your project that are not necessarily reflected in the application narratives or project progress reports (PPRs)?
3. What has helped set up this project / your organization for success? What aspects of the [project name] award and program, if any, have helped set you up for success? What aspects or conditions have hindered the project?
4. How has your project changed, if at all, since it was approved and what led to those changes?

5. What have been some of the key achievements of your project so far and who has benefitted from those achievements?
6. What changes, if any, have you observed in:
 - a. **Regional collaboration** among your organization and other entities on [topic area] that you would attribute to the project/program?
 - b. **Community engagement** in your organization or the project more broadly? What supports or hinders meaningful community engagement?
 - c. **Enduring capacity** in the project region? What have you found supports or hinders regional collaboration, community engagement, and enduring capacity?
 - d. **Climate risk** in your region, including progress towards reducing [topic area] risk in your region?

Technical Assistance (TA)

1. What type of technical assistance support have your project and your organization's portion of the project needed the most since the project started?
2. To what extent have you been able to access NOAA supported technical assistance related to your needs?
3. How satisfied are you with the [program name] in addressing your project's technical assistance needs? What contributed to your satisfaction or lack of satisfaction?
4. Do you have any suggestions for how the program could improve its delivery of technical assistance?
5. In what ways has the technical assistance provided through the program helped or not helped your project? Specifically, how has technical assistance enhanced risk reduction? Collaboration? Engagement with [specific area] communities? Capacity for resilience?
6. What, if anything, (e.g., project activities, outputs and outcomes) would not have been possible without technical assistance?
7. Overall, what kinds of technical assistance have been most useful to your organization's portion of the project and to the project overall? Was there any TA provided or required that you did not find useful?
8. Are there any topics, events, or types of assistance you feel are missing at this point, that you'd like to have support in?
9. Is there anything else you feel is important to share about your experience with technical assistance that we haven't talked about?
10. What is your organization's previous experience with NOAA, and with managing [e.g., receiving, managing, reporting on] large sources of funding?

11. What [topic area] related topics would you like to know more about? What is your preferred way to consume [topic area]-related communications?
12. What audiences in your state would benefit from understanding the program outcomes and lessons learned? From your perspective, what are the most valuable elements to share with these different audiences?

Additional questions only for Mentors of [topic area] Fellows:

1. What expectations did you have regarding the support that the fellow would provide in the [project name] when you requested a fellow?
2. In what ways has the fellow supported your project? How have the fellow's products been used in the project?
3. Are there any plans for keeping [fellow's name] on with the project in some capacity past their fellowship period?
4. What kinds of support have you found the most helpful related to working with a [topic area] Fellow (e.g., mentorship training, assistance with developing a scope of work for your fellow)?
 - a. What types of improvements would you suggest related to the support offered for working with a CRRC Resilience Fellow?
5. Is there anything else you'd like us to know about the fellowship program, or thoughts on how the fellowship program could be improved to increase its utility to the projects?

Proposal Submission

1. **Did you have institutional support (e.g., Grants Administrator) that helped you prepare application materials and/or submitted your proposal?**
 - Yes
 - No
 - I don't know
2. **Thinking about your experience completing your proposal and other application materials, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.**
 - The amount of work and time needed to complete my proposal was appropriate for the level of available funding.
 - I feel confident that I provided the appropriate Readiness Levels for my project proposal and proposed project outputs.
 - It was easy to complete the budget forms (SF-424) for my application package. *[Skip if Answered Yes to 1]*
 - The amount of work and time invested in crafting my data management plan was appropriate to ensure compliance with the latest data management requirements.
 - I had all of the information I needed to complete my proposal.
3. **After you submitted your application on grants.gov, it routed through the eRA system. Thinking about your experience with the eRA system, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.**
 - It was clear that the lead PI on my proposal needed an eRA account to submit the final proposal.
 - I clearly understood the submission requirements for the eRA system before submitting my final proposal.
 - The eRA proposal formatting requirements were easy to understand.
 - The time it took for my proposal to pass through both the grants.gov and eRA validation checks was reasonable.
 - The process for addressing any eRA validation errors was clear and easy to follow.
 - I clearly understood that eRA validation errors needed to be addressed, while validation warnings did not require action for my proposal to be considered "successfully submitted."

Changes to the NOFO Process

The next few questions will ask you about specific changes that were made to the Weather Program Office (WPO) Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) process and announcement(s).

Change from a Single Announcement to Multiple Individual Announcements

4. **As a result of NOAA's grant management system change, WPO launched six (6) individual Notices of Funding Opportunities in FY25, each representing a single competition (e.g., Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences NOFO, Observations NOFO), instead of a single omnibus Notice of Funding Opportunity. Did you notice this change?**
- Yes
 - No
 - I'm not sure
5. **[If Yes Q21] Please reflect on your experience with the transition to six (6) individual Notice of Funding Opportunity announcements (NOFO) in FY25. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree:**
- The individual NOFO announcements made it difficult to find research priorities relevant to my work.
 - Reviewing several individual NOFO announcements increased my workload and created additional burden.
 - Reading through six (6) individual NOFO announcements to find relevant research priorities was time-consuming.
 - The individual NOFO announcements increased my interest in applying to multiple competitions.
 - I would prefer this approach of using individual NOFO announcements for future WPO funding opportunities.

Changes to the Collaboration Form

6. **Please consider your experience with the Testbed Collaboration Form process in the FY25 Notice of Funding Opportunity and indicate your level of agreement with the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree:**
- It was easy to determine whether my project required a Testbed Collaboration Form.
 - The instructions for when to submit the Testbed Collaboration Form were clear.
 - The clarification about when to use the Testbed Collaboration Form helped me save time when preparing my application.

- I would prefer the Testbed Collaboration Form continue to be used in this way in future WPO funding opportunities.

Changes to Letters of Support

7. Please consider your experience with the Request for NOAA Federal Support (previously known as “Letters of Support”) in the FY25 Notice of Funding Opportunity and indicate your level of agreement with the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree:

- I have a clear understanding of when and why the Request for NOAA Federal Support would be required.
- It was clear that I needed to submit a Request for NOAA Federal Support only if my project’s budget intended to include eligible funding requests by NOAA federal collaborators.
- The clarification on when the Request for NOAA Federal Support is needed saved me time when preparing my application.
- I would prefer the Request for NOAA Federal Support to continue being used in this way in future WPO funding opportunities.

Changes to Abstract Reporting Requirements

8. Please reflect on your experience writing the abstract for your final proposal submission for the FY25 Notices of Funding Opportunities. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree:

- The short sentence prompts made it easy to prepare my abstract for submission.
- I found the abstract template helpful when writing my abstract.
- The short sentence prompts reduced the time and effort needed to write my abstract.
- There was information I wanted to include with my abstract that did not fit within the provided short sentence prompts.
- I would prefer to continue using this short sentence prompt format in future WPO funding opportunities.

9. [open-ended] What was one change in the FY25 Notices of Funding Opportunities that you found particularly helpful or challenging, and why?

Increased Time Applicants Have Between Receiving LOI Feedback and Final Proposal Due Date

10. Please reflect on your experience with the timeline between receiving Letter of Intent (LOI) feedback and submitting your final proposal in the FY25 Notices of Funding

Opportunities. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree:

- The additional time between receiving LOI feedback and the final proposal deadline was helpful for incorporating LOI feedback into my proposal materials.
- The additional time improved the quality of my application materials.
- The extended timeframe allowed sufficient time to coordinate with my project team and collaborators.
- The additional time gave me sufficient time to coordinate with my institutional support staff (e.g., Grants Administrator).
- The extended timeframe reduced stress during proposal preparation.
- I would like to see this extended timeframe continued in future WPO funding opportunities.

11. What was one change in the FY25 Notices of Funding Opportunities that you found particularly helpful or challenging, and why?

Interactions with WPO Program Staff

12. Did you interact with Weather Program Office (WPO) program staff prior to submitting your Letter of Intent (LOI) or proposal application materials?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I'm not sure

13. [If Yes to Q12] Think about the interactions you had with WPO staff. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

- I found my interactions with WPO staff helpful when preparing my application materials.
- I gained new knowledge about WPO's funding opportunity from my interactions with WPO staff.
- My interactions with WPO staff addressed questions I had about WPO's funding opportunity.
- I felt comfortable reaching out to WPO staff with questions about WPO's funding opportunity.
- I know that I can ask questions about WPO's funding opportunity by sending an email to the WPO competition email address.

14. [If No or I'm not sure to Q12] You indicated that you did not interact with WPO program staff. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree to help us better understand why you did not reach out.

- ☐ I did not know that I could reach out to Weather Program Office (WPO) program staff with questions.
- ☐ I had trouble locating contact information for WPO program staff and/or competition managers.
- ☐ Now that I know I can reach out to WPO program staff and/or competition managers, I am likely to do this in the future.

15. Overall, how satisfied are you with WPO's Notice of Funding Opportunity application process?

- ☐ Very dissatisfied,
- ☐ dissatisfied,
- ☐ neither satisfied nor dissatisfied,
- ☐ satisfied,
- ☐ very satisfied

16. Compared to other funding agencies, WPO's Notice of Funding Opportunity application process is. . .

- ☐ Much easier to complete,
- ☐ somewhat easier to complete,
- ☐ about the same level of difficulty to complete,
- ☐ somewhat harder to complete, and
- ☐ much harder to complete.
- ☐ I have never submitted to another funding agency, so I cannot answer this question

17. [open-ended] If you have applied for funding in previous years, how does your experience with the FY25 Notices of Funding Opportunities compare to previous years?

POST KICKOFF SURVEY

1. [Program] Under which NOAA [Program Office] competition did you receive an award?
[Options may be updated as appropriate]
 - ☐ Social, Behavioral, and Economic Science (SBES)
 - ☐ Joint Technology Transfer Initiative (JTTI)
 - ☐ Observations
 - ☐ Climate Testbed (CTB)
 - ☐ Seasonal to Subseasonal (S2S)
 - ☐ Vortex-USA
 - ☐ Fire Weather and Atmospheric Composition
 - ☐ Weather Testbeds
 - ☐ Innovations
 - ☐ Other:
2. [role] Which of the following best describes your project role?
 - ☐ Lead Principal Investigator (PI)
 - ☐ Co-PI
 - ☐ Co-I
 - ☐ Post-Doc
 - ☐ Graduate Student
 - ☐ Undergraduate Student
 - ☐ NOAA Collaborator or Point of Contact
 - ☐ Other: _____
3. [past experience] Not including your current award, have you or your organization previously received an award from [Program]?
 - ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ I'm not sure
4. Do you have suggestions on how the NOAA [Program] can improve the resources it provides to new or returning applicants? (select all that apply)
 - ☐ Applicant webinar
 - ☐ Grant writing workshops
 - ☐ Notice of Funding Opportunity overview guide/summary
 - ☐ Streamlined Notice of Funding Opportunity
 - ☐ How to apply guide
 - ☐ Sample application/template

- ☐ FAQs
 - ☐ Other _____
- 5. Do you have any additional suggestions on how to improve the application process?
- 6. [past experience 2] Have you ever participated in the development of a NOAA transition plan?
 - ☐ Yes
 - [Transition plans: past attitude] Based on your past experience(s), do you think the transition plan development process is:
 - Unpleasant.....Pleasant
 - Complex.....Straightforward^[*]
 - Rigid.....Flexible^[*]
 - Isolating....Collaborative
 - ☐ No
- 7. [past experience 3] Have you worked with a NOAA collaborator in the past?
 - ☐ Yes
 - [Past Collaboration quality] Based on your past experience, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about your previous NOAA Collaborators and/or Points of Contact, where 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.
 - [Collaboration quality: trust] I felt like I could trust my NOAA [Collaborator(s)/Point of Contact(s)] ^[3]
 - [Collaboration quality: open mindedness] My NOAA [Collaborator(s)/Point of Contact(s)] were open to my ideas ^[3]
 - [Collaboration quality: helpful] My NOAA [Collaborator(s)/Point of Contact(s)] were helpful in guiding me through the transition process
 - [Collaboration quality: expertise] My NOAA [Collaborator(s)/Point of Contact(s)] had the expertise needed to transition my research output(s)
 - [Collaboration quality: time] My NOAA [Collaborator(s)/Point of Contact(s)] made time to meet with me and my research team to discuss our project and/or the transition plan.^[*]
 - ☐ No
- 8. [motivation to apply] What motivated you to apply to the most recent [Program] [INSERT COMPETITION NAME]. Please select all that apply. ^[1]
 - ☐ To secure more research funding

- ☐ Interest in the competition's program priorities
 - ☐ Desire to work on NOAA applied issues
 - ☐ Pursue research relevant to expertise
 - ☐ Support post doc or student
 - ☐ Other: _____
9. [satisfaction with project kickoff] On a scale from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied), how satisfied were you with the **[INSERT COMPETITION NAME]** kickoff meeting? ^[2]
- ☐ Very satisfied
 - ☐ Satisfied
 - ☐ Neutral
 - ☐ Dissatisfied
 - ☐ Very dissatisfied
 - ☐ Did not attend
10. [Transition plans: attitude] Per NOAA policy, your project may require a written [transition plan](#). Do you think the transition plan writing process will be:
- ☐ Unpleasant.....Pleasant
 - ☐ Complex.....Straightforward[*]
 - ☐ Rigid.....Flexible[*]
 - ☐ Isolating....Collaborative

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

11. [Transition plans: importance] I believe developing a transition plan is an important part of transitioning my research outputs to NOAA.
12. [Transition plan: flexibility] I believe my NOAA transition plan can change as my project evolves.^[*]
13. [Readiness levels: understanding] I understand what NOAA's readiness levels mean^[*]
14. [Readiness levels: confidence] I find it easy to assign the appropriate readiness level to my project^[*]
15. [Readiness levels: importance] NOAA's readiness levels are important to me^[*]
16. [Overall R2X confidence] I believe that with NOAA's help, I will be able to transition my research output(s) at the end of my project

17. [Knowledge transfer] I believe NOAA will use the knowledge generated from my research project^[*]
18. [Collaboration] [open ended] What are your expectations for your NOAA collaborators/points of contact?

END OF YEAR 1 SURVEY

1. [role]Which of the following best describes your project role?
 - ☐ Lead PI
 - ☐ Co-PI
 - ☐ Co-I
 - ☐ Post-Doc
 - ☐ Graduate Student
 - ☐ Undergraduate Student
 - ☐ NOAA Collaborator or Point of Contact
 - ☐ Other: _____
2. [Transition plans: attitude] Per NOAA policy, your project may have required a written [transition plan](#). In your experience over the last 12 months, taking part in the **[INSERT COMPETITION NAME]**'s transition plan process has been:
 - ☐ Unpleasant.....Pleasant
 - ☐ Complex.....Straightforward[*]
 - ☐ Rigid.....Flexible[*]
 - ☐ Isolating....Collaborative

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

3. [Transition plans: importance] I believe developing a transition plan is an important part of transitioning my research outputs to NOAA.
4. [Transition plans: confidence] I am confident I could write a transition plan in the future.
5. [Transition plans: flexibility] I believe my NOAA transition plan can change as my project evolves.^[*]
6. [Transition plan: ease] Receiving a pre-populated transition plan made it easy to participate in the transition plan process.
7. [Readiness levels: understanding] I understand what NOAA's readiness levels mean.^[*]
8. [Readiness levels: confidence] I find it easy to assign the appropriate readiness level to my project^[*]
9. [Readiness levels: importance] NOAA's readiness levels are important to me.

10. [Overall R2X confidence] I believe that with NOAA's help, I will be able to transition my research output(s) at the end of my project.
11. [Knowledge transfer] I believe NOAA will use the knowledge generated from my research project.^[*]
12. At this point in your award, how would you rate the level of burden associated with the following [Program] activities? Please indicate your level of burden on a scale from 1 = not at all burdensome to 5 = very burdensome.
 - Participating in the transition plan process
 - Preparing for and participating in a semi-annual review meeting
 - Writing a progress report
 - Submitting specific award conditions, award action requests, and/or progress reports in the online grants management system
 - Meeting/communicating with your NOAA collaborator(s) and Point(s) of Contact

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

13. [Collaboration quality: trust] I feel I can trust my NOAA [Collaborator(s)/Point(s) of Contact]^[3]
14. [Collaboration quality: open mindedness] My NOAA [Collaborator(s)/Point(s) of Contact] were open to my ideas^[3]
15. [Collaboration quality: helpful] My NOAA [Collaborator(s)/Point(s) of Contact] have been helpful in guiding me through the transition process.
16. [Collaboration quality: expertise] My NOAA [Collaborator(s)/Point(s) of Contact] have the expertise needed to transition my research output(s).
17. [Collaboration quality: time] My NOAA [Collaborator(s)/Point(s) of Contact] made time to meet with me and my research team to discuss our project and/or the transition plan.^[*]
18. [Collaboration quality: cohort] I found the cohort approach helpful for collaborating with other social science researchers. *[Remove this question if you do not use a cohort approach].*

[NOAA Collaborator and Points of Contact Only] Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

19. [Collaboration quality: open mindedness] My academic partners were open to my contributions to improve project usefulness^[3]

20. [Collaboration quality: time] My academic partners made time to meet with me to discuss our project and/or the transition plan.^[*]
21. [Collaboration quality: collaboration meetings] I found the one-on-one meetings helpful for collaborating with my academic partners.
22. [Usefulness of resources and/or activities] In your experience over the past 12 months, how *useful* have the following resources and/or activities been to you, where 1 = not at all useful to 7 = extremely useful ^[4] [Options may be updated as appropriate]
- Cohort Portal in Smartsheet
 - Competition Checklist
 - One-on-one collaboration meetings with your NOAA Collaborators
 - [Program's] Social Science Program's Semi-Annual Reviews
 - Receiving a Pre-populated Transition Plan
 - **[INSERT OTHER COMPETITION RESOURCES HERE]**
23. [open-ended; most valuable experience] Reflecting on the past 12 months of your award period, what did you find most valuable and why?
24. Open-ended; least valuable experience] Reflecting on the past 12 months of your award period, What did you find least valuable and why?
25. [open ended] Are there any additional comments, questions, or concerns you would like to share with the **[INSERT COMPETITION PROGRAM]**.

EXIT SURVEY

Note: This survey is sent out after receiving their final report.

1. [role] Which of the following best describes your project role?
 - ☐ Lead PI
 - ☐ Co-PI
 - ☐ Co-I
 - ☐ Post-Doc
 - ☐ Graduate Student
 - ☐ Undergraduate Student
 - ☐ NOAA Collaborator
 - ☐ NOAA Point of Contact
 - ☐ Other: _____
2. [transition plan: attitude] In your experience over the award period, taking part in the **[INSERT COMPETITION HERE]**'s transition plan process has been:
 - ☐ Unpleasant.....Pleasant
 - ☐ Complex.....Straightforward[*]
 - ☐ Rigid.....Flexible[*]
 - ☐ Isolating....Collaborative

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

3. [Transition plans: importance] I believe developing a transition plan was an important part of transitioning my research outputs to NOAA.
4. [Transition plans: confidence] I am confident I could write a transition plan in the future.
5. [Transition plans: flexibility] I believe transition plans can change as a project evolves.^[*]
6. [Transition plan: ease] Receiving a pre-populated transition plan with pre-established language made writing a transition plan easy.^[*]
7. [Readiness levels: confidence] I found it easy to assign the appropriate readiness level to my project^[*]
8. [Readiness levels: understanding] I understand what the NOAA readiness levels mean^[*]
9. [Readiness levels: importance] NOAA's readiness levels are important to me^[*]
10. [Overall R2X confidence] I believe that with NOAA's help, my research output(s) will be transitioned and used in practice.

11. [Knowledge transfer] I believe NOAA will use the knowledge generated from my research project.^[*]

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

12. [Collaboration quality: trust] I feel I can trust my NOAA [Collaborator(s)/Point(s) of Contact]^[3]
13. [Collaboration quality: open mindedness] My NOAA [Collaborator(s)/Point(s) of Contact] were open to my ideas.^[3]
14. [Collaboration quality: helpful] My NOAA [Collaborator(s)/Point(s) of Contact] were helpful in guiding me through the transition process.
15. [Collaboration quality: expertise] My NOAA [Collaborator(s)/Point(s) of Contact] had the expertise needed to transition my research output(s).
16. [Collaboration quality: time] My NOAA [Collaborator(s)/Point(s) of Contact] made time to meet with me and my research team to discuss our project and/or the transition plan.^[*]
17. [Collaboration quality: cohort] I found the cohort approach helpful for collaborating with other social science researchers. [*Remove this question if you do not use a cohort approach*].

[NOAA Collaborator and Points of Contact Only] Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

18. [Collaboration quality: open mindedness] My academic partners were open to my contributions to improve project usefulness.^[3]
19. [Collaboration quality: time] My academic partners made time to meet with me to discuss our project and/or the transition plan.^[*]
20. [Collaboration quality: collaboration meetings] I found the one-on-one meetings helpful for collaborating with my academic partners.
21. [Open-ended] Reflecting on your experiences over the award period, what are some of your best practices or recommendations for effective collaboration?
22. What type(s) of research outputs did your project produce? Please select all that apply.
- Community Outreach
 - Congressional Report/Communication
 - Data Analysis, Assessment, or Visualization
 - Data/Datasets/Metadata

- Data Collection Instruments
- Documentation or other Publication (e.g., Tech Memo, Final Report)
- Field Notes, Transcripts, or Observations
- Laboratory/Research Instruments
- Methodology
- Educational Materials (e.g., lesson plans)
- Enhancing an Existing Methodology
- Meeting, Conference, or Workshop Planning Materials
- Model, Model Improvement, or Model Software/Code/Algorithm
- Observing System or Platform
- Observing Sensor, Software, or other components
- Publicly-Available Data/Tool/Service/Portal
- Peer-reviewed Publication
- Presentation/Talk
- Research-guided Recommendations
- Stakeholder/User Product or Service (e.g., User Application, Forecast/Outlook)
- Stakeholder/User Product or Service Enhancement
- Stewardship Recommendations (e.g., Law/Policy/Protections/Protocols)
- Student Paper, Thesis, and/or Dissertation
- Training Materials
- Other Hardware
- Other Software Algorithms and Code
- Other

Over the course of your project, how often did you engage in the following knowledge transfer activities, where 1 = never and 5 = very often. You may also indicate if an item is “not applicable (N/A).” [6][*]

23. [Knowledge Transfer 1] I sent my research results to the private industry, government agencies other than NOAA, and/or other users outside of academic institutions (e.g., non-profit).
24. [Knowledge Transfer 2] I was invited to present my research results to groups and organizations who could make direct use of them.
25. [Knowledge Transfer 3] I was asked to sit in on working groups that were involved in efforts to directly apply new knowledge, including my own research.
26. [Knowledge Transfer 4] I provided consulting services to private industry, government agencies, and/or organizations associated with my research field.

27. [Knowledge Transfer 5] The use of my research results has contributed to the development of new or improved products or services.
28. [Knowledge Transfer 6] Myself and/or others have attempted to commercialize the results of my project.

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. You may also indicate if an item is "not applicable (N/A)." ^[5]

During the course of my award:

29. [customer satisfaction 1] The **[INSERT COMPETITION NAME]** staff responded to me in a timely manner when I had a question about my award.
30. [customer satisfaction 2] The **[INSERT COMPETITION NAME]** staff accommodated my circumstances and requests to the best of their ability.
31. [customer satisfaction 3] The **[INSERT COMPETITION NAME]** staff provided me with a reasonable amount of time to respond to inquiries/resolve issues with my award.
32. [customer satisfaction 4] The **[INSERT COMPETITION NAME]** staff provided me with accurate and clear information.
33. [customer satisfaction 5] I found my interactions with the **[INSERT COMPETITION NAME]** staff helpful during my award period.
34. [customer satisfaction 6] The **[INSERT COMPETITION NAME]** staff were responsive to my inquiries during my award period.
35. [customer satisfaction 7] The **[INSERT COMPETITION NAME]** staff helped me navigate the transition plan process to the best of their ability.
36. At this point in your award, how would you rate the level of burden associated with the following [Program] activities? Please indicate your level of burden on a scale from 1 = not at all burdensome to 5 = very burdensome.
- Participating in the transition plan process
 - Preparing for and participating in a semi-annual review meeting
 - Writing a progress report
 - Submitting specific award conditions, award action requests, and/or progress reports in the online grants management system
 - Meeting/communicating with your NOAA collaborator(s) and Point(s) of Contact
37. [Usefulness of resources] In your experience over the award period, how *useful* have the following resources and/or activities been to you, where 1 = not at all useful to 5 = extremely useful. ^[4]

- Cohort Portal in Smartsheet
 - Competition Checklist
 - One-on-one collaboration meetings with your NOAA Collaborators
 - Semi-Annual Reviews
 - Pre-Populated Transition Plans
 - **[INSERT OTHER COMPETITION RESOURCES HERE]**
38. [open-ended; overall experience] Reflecting on your award period, what did you find most valuable and why?
39. [open-ended; overall experience] Reflecting on your award period, what did you find least valuable and why?

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

40. [apply in future] I would apply to a funding opportunity through **[INSERT COMPETITION NAME]** in the future.
41. [open ended] What recommendations, if any, would you make to **[INSERT COMPETITION NAME]** to improve your experience?

Additional Survey Questions for Unsuccessful Grant Applicants Only

1. Did you request a feedback session to learn about the feedback reviewers provided?

- Yes
- No

2. Do you have any additional suggestions on how to improve the feedback session?

Additional Survey Questions for Incomplete Grant Applicants Only

1. What competition were you invited to apply for?

- [will provide a list of available competitions]

2. What prevented you from completing your application for a [Program] grant? (check all that apply)

- Funding received from another source
- Shifting priorities
- Level of effort to complete the application was too great
- Difficulty securing match funding
- Difficulty securing partners
- Not enough time to complete the application
- Problems with the Grants.gov or SAM system
- Other_____

3. How many federal grants have you applied to in the past?

- 0
- 1-3
- 4-7
- 8 or more

4. Of the federal grants applied to, how many were funded?

- 0
- 1-3
- 4-7
- 8 or more

References

- [1]: NOAA Climate Program Office MAPP Stakeholder Surveys
- [2]: NOAA 2020 IT Security & Privacy Virtual Conference Customer Survey
- [3]: Mâsse, L. C., Moser, R. P., Stokols, D., Taylor, B. K., Marcus, S. E., Morgan, G. D., ... & Trochim, W. M. (2008). Measuring collaboration and transdisciplinary integration in team science. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 35, S151-S160.
- [4]: NOAA Libraries: Usefulness and Quality of Services OMB
- [5]: EDA Grantee Customer Satisfaction Survey
- [6]: [Landry, R., Amara, N., & Ouimet, M. \(2007\). Determinants of knowledge transfer: evidence from Canadian university researchers in natural sciences and engineering. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 32\(6\), 561-592.](#)
- [*] Connection back to WPO's [SBS R2O Workshop Report](#).