

Appendix I15. Public Comment #8

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: August 15, 2022
Received: August 09, 2022
Status: Posted
Posted: August 09, 2022
Tracking No. 16m-nh2d-75va
Comments Due: August 09, 2022
Submission Type: API

Docket: FNS-2022-0017

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request-Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education and Obesity Prevention Grant (SNAP-Ed) National Program Evaluation and Reporting System (N-PEARS)

Comment On: FNS-2022-0017-0001

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals: Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education and Obesity Prevention Grant National Program Evaluation and Reporting System

Document: FNS-2022-0017-0078

Comment on FR Doc # 2022-12504

Submitter Information

Name: Anonymous Anonymous

Email: leejs@uga.edu

General Comment

See attached file(s)

Attachments

UGA SNAP-Ed PEARS Review Form 080922 for Upload

PEARS SNAP-Ed Annual Plan and Report Forms & Mockups

University of Georgia SNAP-Ed Comments

Annual Plan Form

Section-Page #, Description of sub- section	Comments by Reviewer
Table P1.2. Overall	“SNAP-Ed Eligible Population” should be defined as not all states use the same definition and criteria.

Annual Report

Page # and Section heading	Comments by Reviewer
General	Completing the FY2023 annual report using the PEARS system before submitting the plan in the new system will be time-consuming and inefficient. The plan and annual report are linked, and autopopulate functionality in annual report will not work. It is better to wait until FY2024 to complete annual report in the new system once the plans are also submitted in the new system.
General	Will there be a link between the current PEARS and the new Annual Report system? For example, can Table R4.3 (Direct education reach) pull information from current PEARS?
Project sites	We need to enter all sites involved in SNAP-Ed activities during the fiscal year. Again, can this section retrieve data from PEARS or link to the approved site list that the state maintains? This entry will be very time-consuming. What is the goal of entering data by site?
Table R4.2. Project Sites	PEARS should be synced with the new Annual Report System as PEARS will be used to determine “Area Type” and potentially “Site Addresses.”
Table R4.3. Direct Education Reach/Mode of delivery (p4-7)	Programs with the “Virtual, interactive multimedia” mode should not skip the following two questions on the types of direct education series and total session number.
Individual Behavior Change (MT1, MT2, MT3)	All outcome indicator results are asked to be entered separately by age group. Of note, current age groups are four and the new proposed age groups are five or eight (with narrowed age groups for 5-17) Of note, there are differences with the mockup (# of individuals meeting guidelines is included in the mockup, but not in the report)

PSE Changes (p4-11)	Overall, outcome reporting does not include ST outcomes. How to report “planning and preparing for implementation” (plan p3-2)?
Social Marketing Campaigns/Campaign Scale (p4-17)	It is unclear what this question's purpose is and how to answer it if multiple campaigns with different scales are delivered during the same fiscal year.
Table r4.10. Potential Reach by market Segment (p4-18)	Not all the market segment group data are available
Table R4.11. MT12b: Reach and Impressions by Channel	Missing Pinterest under social media and Texting option. Of note, texting is included under the indirect education channels (electronic materials) (p4-21)
Table R5 series	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redundant data entry between “Project results” and “Evaluation” sections (e.g., data collection tools). Unclear or inconsistent unit of reporting in project results and evaluation sections (e.g., intervention, project, sites, indicator, evaluation type) “Results and conclusions” section: only narrative summary “Use of results” section: Not all items in the dissemination could happen during the intervention period (e.g., conference presentations and peer-reviewed papers)
Evaluation overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited to mostly background info already reported in the plan (not sure if the plan info will be autopopulate?) in a narrative summary format with word limits. For example, "SNAP-Ed Outreach" could have many different interventions/ approaches. It would be hard to give an explanation on them all. Perhaps- there should be drop down boxes where we can choose applicable responses & then a text box for clarification as needed. Evaluation data for state and regional aggregation could be done only for program reach and evaluation participants. There is no option to enter data on the detailed process (critical for PSE) and outcome/impact evaluation. Not much room for reporting qualitative evaluation data
Budget overall	Planning and tracking the budget by the project is not easy, nor realistic

System Mockups

Page # and Section heading	Comments by Reviewer
General	The expectations of completing these reports are ambitious and pose a huge burden at the local level. I do have some

	<p>logistical questions for the developing team. My apologies if the answer has been provided and I missed them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the plan and the report password protected? • How much time is given to work on the documents once started? • How many people from the same IA can work on the report at the same time? • What is the value of including information about SNAP participants if the source of information is the federal government? It seems unnecessary. • Many responses are included in a narrative format. It will be difficult to aggregate to show collective impact.
P1.1 Filled by the state only.	Can the age group for the Diet and PA behaviors, etc., be pre-determined by the report? Table P.1.2 has age categories.
Section 3 One response per project.	How are the projects prioritized? Is there a limit to the number of projects to work with?