Extracting Numbers from ANR Portal Results

Event Profile

First Name	JOHN
Last Name	AGENT
Primary County	Lone Star
Additional County	.
Additional County	.
Additional County	.
Additional County	.
Additional County	.
Additional County	.
Type of Plan	Outcome
State Goal	Goal 2 (Agriculture, Natural Resources, Economic and Environmental Education)
TExAS Plan Number	.
TExAS Task Number	.
Type of Event	Group educational event
Event Title	EARLY WINTER CATTLE PROGRAM
Event Date	20-NOV-2025
Economic Benefit an Explicit Goal	Yes
CEUs Offered	Pesticide
Partial Cost Recovery Event	.
Zip Code Where the Event Occurred	76645
Scan Form ID	59331
Batch number assigned by OD	66465
Surveys Returned	42
Total Attendance	49
Survey Response Rate	85.7%

The first page of your output (below) is standard for most results sent by the Office of Data and Accountability (ODA). It contains a profile of your event built mostly with information from your cover sheet. ODA adds the calculation of a **response rate** by comparing the **number of surveys returned** versus **attendance**. You may want to report these three pieces of information.

In this example, 42 survey forms were processed while attendance was listed as 49 on the cover sheet, for a response rate of 85.7%

Table: Pre Means, Post Means & Percent Change

	Program Content	Mean Before	Mean After	Percent Change
1	1-d-1 wildlife tax valuation eligibility requirements and how to maintain eligibility.	2.33	3.67	44.7%
2	Methods of identifying common pest/predator tracks.	1.63	3.13	50.0%
3	When and where to provide supplementary free water.	2.00	3.50	50.0%
4	Methods of wildlife census techniques.	1.78	3.22	48.0%
5	Methods of nonlethal predator control and exclusion.	2.00	3.29	43.0%

Percent Change = ((Post Mean - Pre Mean) / 3) * 100

The next table shows the mean score in level of understanding for each statement before and after the program (highlighted in blue) using a 4-point scale where 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, and 4= Excellent. For example, the mean level of identifying common pest/predator tracks was 1.63 before; then 3.13 after the program (a 50.0% percent increase on the scale). Here is an example statement to report this:

- As a result of the program, there was a 50.0% increase in mean level of understanding (post vs. pre) of feral hog control methods.

However, some may find it easier to interpret change in level of understanding by discussing the proximity of the mean scores to the four points on the scale rather than the percent change value. Here are a few example statements using that approach:

- On average, participants moved roughly from a “poor-fair” understanding to “good” identifying common pest/predator tracks (on a 4-point scale).
- On average, participants moved roughly from a “fair” understanding to an “good-excellent” understanding of when and where to provide supplementary free water (on a 4-point scale).

Percent change (highlighted in red) is calculated using the following formula:

Percent Change = ((Post Mean - Pre Mean) / (Number of Scale Points - 1) * 100

This differs from the traditional percent change formula as this takes scale points into consideration. The traditional formula returns the relative increase or decrease between two values (pre and post), expressed as a percentage of the initial value (pre). On other hand, the modified percent change calculation returns the relative increase or decrease along the length of the scale. There are two arguments in favor of using this formula over the traditional calculation of percent change:

- Percent change does not exceed 100 (traditional percent change can exceed 100)

- Percent change is consistent for the same “post – pre” distance on the scale (traditional percent change will produce different numbers). For example:

    - Traditional percent change
        - Pct Chg = (3.50 – 2.25) / 2.25 = 55.6%
    - Traditional percent change with same “post – pre” distance of 1.25
        - Pct Chg = (4.00 – 2.75) / 2.25 = 45.5%

    - Percent change on a scale
        - Pct Chg = (3.50 – 2.25) / 3 = 41.7%
    - Percent change on a scale with same “post – pre” distance of 1.25.
        - Pct Chg = (4.00 – 2.75) / 3 = 41.7%

Table: % at Good/Excellent, Pct Who Increased Understanding

	Program Content	Pct. at Good or Excellent Before the Program	Pct. at Good or Excellent After the Program	Pct. Point Difference (After vs. Before)	Pct. With Any Increase in Understanding
1	1-d-1 wildlife tax valuation eligibility requirements and how to maintain eligibility.	33.3%	100.0%	66.7	77.8%
2	Methods of identifying common pest/predator tracks.	25.0%	75.0%	50.0	100.0%
3	When and where to provide supplementary free water.	37.5%	100.0%	62.5	100.0%
4	Methods of wildlife census techniques.	0.0%	100.0%	100.0	100.0%
5	Methods of nonlethal predator control and exclusion.	28.6%	100.0%	71.4	100.0%

In this summary table from the Short Report, the Program Content column shows the items listed on the survey instrument. The next two columns (highlighted in green) show the percent of participants at a "good or excellent" level of understanding before the program vs. after, for each item. Percent Point Difference (highlighted in blue) is calculated by subtracting the % of good or excellent **BEFORE** the program **from** the % of good or excellent **AFTER** the program. In this case, there was a 50.0 percentage point increase in participants at an excellent or good level of understanding of methods of identifying common pest/predator tracks (after the program vs. before the program).

The final column indicates the percentage of participants with any perceived increase in understanding of the item (highlighted in red). This includes any participant who had an **AFTER** rating higher than **BEFORE** (poor to fair, poor to good, poor to excellent, fair to good, fair to excellent, and good to excellent). Looking at the table, all participants (100%) perceived an increase in their understanding of methods of identifying common pest/predator tracks.

(CHANGE) 1st Item - Level of Understanding

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Increase in understanding ***	7	77.8	77.8	77.8
	No change	2	22.2	22.2	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

(Understanding Before) - 1-d-1 wildlife tax valuation eligibility requirements and how to maintain eligibility.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	1	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Good	2	22.2	22.2	33.3
	Fair	5	55.6	55.6	88.9
	Poor	1	11.1	11.1	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

(Understanding After) - 1-d-1 wildlife tax valuation eligibility requirements and how to maintain eligibility.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	6	66.7	66.7	66.7
	Good	3	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	9	100.0	100.0	

One of the tables you might encounter is **Change in Understanding**. In the example above (1st table), 77.8% of participants perceived an increase in understanding of 1-d-1 wildlife tax valuation eligibility requirements and how to maintain eligibility (highlighted in green). This includes any participant with an **AFTER** rating higher than their **BEFORE** rating (poor to fair, poor to good, poor to excellent, fair to good, fair to excellent, and good to excellent).

The **Valid Percent** column excludes missing values, as compared to the **Percent** column which includes missing values. If a survey question does not have any missing values, the percentages in these two columns will be the same. Typically, Valid Percent columns are used to report percentages.

Cumulative Percent adds up percentages in the Valid Percent column across answer choices. This can be useful for quickly seeing the combined percentages of the top two categories (highlighted in blue). In the example, 100% of participants had an "Excellent" or

“Good” understanding of 1-d-1 wildlife tax valuation eligibility requirements and how to maintain eligibility after the program vs. 33.3% before the program (66.7% percentage point increase).

Percent Point Difference is the simple subtraction of the pre percent from the post percentage (in this case, 100% – 33.3% = 66.7%).

(Intentions to Adopt) - Monitoring techniques to determine what species and how many are present.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Undecided	2	22.2	25.0	25.0
	Plan to adopt ***	6	66.7	75.0	100.0
	Total	8	88.9	100.0	
Missing	Already adopted	1	11.1		
Total		9	100.0		

For the **Intentions to Adopt** section, there is a frequency count for participants who "Plan to adopt" a certain practice/technology.

Using the Percent column: Of **all** program participants, 66.7% indicated they "plan to adopt" safety procedures when working with chemicals and pesticides.

Roughly one of nine participants (11.1%) had already adopted these safety procedures.

Using the Valid Percent column: Of those **who haven't already adopted**, the majority of participants (75.0%) indicated they "plan to adopt" monitoring techniques to determine what species and how many are present. So, the program was very effective in getting participants to move towards actual adoption of these monitoring techniques.

Do you expect additional economic benefit on a per head basis?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	23	54.8	63.9	63.9
	No	13	31.0	36.1	100.0
	Total	36	85.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	14.3		
Total		42	100.0		

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean
Total livestock economic value	27	$0	$6,588	$35,652	$1,320.43
Valid N (listwise)	27				

When looking at economic value tables, please review and confirm that the number (highlighted in red) is plausible for your event.

- If the value is plausible, then you can proceed with using all results provided to you.

- If the maximum value is suspect (implausibly large), it is due to the number of acres or head of livestock (which go into the calculation) being suspect (implausibly large). A respondent error or scanning error may have occurred. Therefore, your economic estimates are invalid and should not be used. Contact ODA to remove such values and we will rerun the results.

As shown above, the percentage of participants who anticipate an economic benefit as a result of the Extension program can also be found in the results table. When reporting "Yes" answers for economic benefit, it is recommended to report valid percent.

The **SUM** is the total amount of anticipated economic benefit from all participants in dollars and the **MEAN** is the average anticipated economic benefit per participant in dollars.

Distribution of Client Categories for Your Event

		Count	Column Valid N %
Client Category	Promoters	36	85.7%
	Passives	5	11.9%
	Detractors	1	2.4%

Your NPS Calculation

1	NPS = 85.7 - 2.4

Net Promoter Score for Your Event

Your Score:	83.3

The Net Promoter Score® (NPS) is a measure of clientele loyalty. NPS is calculated from responses to one simple question, measured on a 0-to-10 rating scale: "Would you recommend us to a friend or colleague?" Based on the NPS, each client is placed into one of three categories: promoters, passives, and detractors. Ultimately, the goal of using the NPS is to increase promoters and decrease detractors. Promoters are 9-10 on the scale, passives are 7-8, and detractors are 6 and below.

- Net Promoter Score (NPS) = % Promoters - % Detractors
- Maximum score possible = 100
- Minimum score possible = -100

In this example, the 36 participants (85.7%) were classified as promoters of Extension programs.

For more information on Net Promoter Scores, visit:

https://oda.tamu.edu/net-promoter-score/