

## NERA response to the NIDB and ESCOP

**Background:** The NIDB was developed to establish a repository of statements that describe the impact of capacity grants. The NIDB users were identified as NIFA, the CMC and its contractor (kglobal), Congress, and others. In 2016, NIDB was identified as not meeting its intent. At that time, a committee was convened to revise the NIDB. CES and AES co-support the NIDB at \$12,500 each annually. Recently, ESCOP and ECOP each dedicated \$5,000 to support the efforts of professional writers to assist in improving the quality of the impact statements.

**2017-2018** NIDB committee (AES directors, CE directors, communicators, and EDs) is convened and met monthly to discuss revising the NIDB. Website look is deemed stale. While the total number of impact statements submitted annually has been robust (2012 – 179; 2013 – 447; 2014 - 597; 2015 - 594; 2016 - 318; 2017 - 510; 2018 – 422), the quality of impact statements is highly variable. Statements in NIDB viewed anecdotally as a liability. Use of statements is unclear. Committee suggests a revision of the website and a means to QC the statements. Directors were asked to volunteer a communicator to review statements submitted by a region to the NIDB.

**10/2018** NERA discusses the NIDB in Lincoln, NE. NERA reflects that impact statement submission rate by NERA institutions is low (see attached.) Further, no NERA institution is willing to provide a reviewer for the QC strategy suggested by the NIDB.

**11/2018** RCR suggests to ESCOP that the experiment stations should cease support for the NIDB.

**2/2019** NIDB chairs seek assistance from regional EDs to secure names for the institutional roles of Director/Administrator, Institution Contact, Impact Editor, Viewer, and Reviewer. NIDB committee runs webinars to train impact statement editors. No Northeast AES' submit names or participate in the webinar.

**NERA question:** Is the NIDB reaching identified audiences and is the NIDB an effective resource in the support our state and federal advocacy efforts as well as NIFA's mandated reporting requirements?

### NERA response to the NIDB and ESCOP:

- NERA sends a letter of non-participation in the NIDB to the NIDB committee.
- NERA informs ESCOP of non-participation in the NIDB.
- NERA recommends to ESCOP:
  - A discussion of the use and utility of the NIDB regionally and nationally. This discussion should include our partners in Extension and NIFA

- If significant utility cannot be demonstrated, that experiment station support for the NIDB be terminated.
- ESCOP engage NIFA to determine the opportunities for inclusion of capacity grant-generated impact statements during the integration of the Plan of Work (includes the Annual Report of Accomplishments and Results) and REEport<sup>1</sup>.

DRAFT

---

<sup>1</sup> The integration of the Plan of Work and REEPort is a result of the work of a panel of experts that convened in 2015 to identify streamlining tactics to improve data quality in reports submitted to NIFA while reducing duplication and the burden of paperwork and time imposed on the LGUs. The full integration is expected to be accomplished by March 1, 2021.