

1. The certifications for this collection in ROCIS have not been completed. As we have previously indicated, we require all certifications to be completed for a submission to be considered complete. The only way to correct this error is for us to remove the collection as "improperly submitted" and to have you resubmit a new version of the same collection. Let me know when you're ready and I will return the collection to you and you can resubmit. [Rachel, I'll work with you on this. Barbara](#)
2. On page 1 of the supporting statement, IMLS states "A second survey approved in the original clearance 3137-0051 will not be repeated for these additional respondents." What kind of information did the second survey collect and why aren't you collecting this information from the new respondents? [The second survey concerned the experiences and perceptions of the IMLS grantees; results were reported in the first three year project report. This survey was not continued in the supplemental part of the project funded on 9/7/2005 because the information that was needed was captured in the first survey.](#)
3. Are the questions in the first survey the same as were asked of the previous respondents? Have they changed at all? [Yes, the survey is the same except for some small changes made based on the responses received in the first survey. The changes are: Part A – question 6 asking for the project director's phone number was eliminated because contact is now done electronically. Part B, Question 11: added an option for Middle School Students; the choice "Additional audiences" is now called "Other"; Added to question 15: "Do you have any additional information or comments on this section of the survey?" Part C – 22 Table added 5 blocks for "Other."](#)
4. The supporting statement (p. 2) indicates that "IMLS will not have access to the original response data linked to specific respondents." How is this possible since all of the responses relate to a specific (and unique) project? [The purpose of this survey was to gather information from the grantees in order to build the pilot registry. Some of the information on each project is published online in the registry, but IMLS did not need to see individual survey responses that helped build the system.](#)
5. The supporting statement (p. 2) indicates that "The purpose of the research is to identify for IMLS the best practices for interoperability and to provide training and tools, if appropriate, to assist projects in making any necessary enhancements to their data to enable aggregation." Please explain how IMLS will identify best practices. [The researchers identified best practices from a combination of the second survey, focus groups, and interviews, all cleared by OMB.](#)
6. Please complete Part B of the supporting statement on statistical methods. This needs to be completed for all surveys. Please be sure to include information on how you selected these 50 respondents (if a sample is being conducted), your expected response rate, planned follow-up activities to increase the response rate, etc. [This is not a statistical survey intended to draw generalizable data from quantitative data, so we would not expect to complete part B. \[Please note: there was not a Part B in the original clearance, either.\] The 50 respondents include the 2005 IMLS grantees that created digital content, the 2006 grantees, and about 5 or 6 projects funded with Illinois LSTA funds.](#)
7. The stated reason for adding the additional 50 respondents at this point is that "The agency needs to add 50 additional grantees to the registry so that the product is complete to date and is more useful to the public." Why weren't these respondents included in the initial data collection effort? [The 2005 grantees were cleared in the initial clearance request, but the clearance ran out before the 2005](#)

grantees could be surveyed. The 2006 grantees and the LSTA grantees were not added to the project until the supplement was funded on 9/7/2005.

How do these respondents differ from the respondents in the first wave of data collection? The 2005 and 2006 IMLS grantees are similar to the previous respondents, but from different years, and so will bring the registry up to date. The LSTA grantees are funded with IMLS state formula grant funds through the state of Illinois, so compete in a different competition for funds from the National Leadership Grant IMLS grantees. One of the purposes of the supplemental funding was to experiment with a few state level grantees to see if their content would be able to be aggregated into the registry and repository scheme. This would indicate any special problems that could be encountered in aggregating state level content into a national database.

8. (Survey, question 22) There is a typo in the instructions for this question: "In the table below there are two columns. This will be corrected.