

IDENTIFYING PROMISING TANF DIVERSION PRACTICES STUDY

RESPONSES TO OMB QUESTIONS

November 6, 2007

I am reassured that the purposive sampling will at least take into consideration some of the “intermediate” outcomes mentioned in the response. Do you think you can revise the supporting statement to make this more clear?

We have inserted language in the OMB supporting statement to make clear that data collected on states’ diversion programs will be one of the sources of information used for selecting states. Please see pages 6 and 16-17 of the supporting statement.

Also, I may just be overlooking it, but I can’t find where the questions about opportunity costs were added to the state telephone interview protocol.

Initially, MPR had added this question only to the module for the solely state-funded cash assistance programs (Module 5) based on an assumption that other types of programs depend mostly on TANF funds. However, the revised version of the protocols includes a question about funding in each of the other modules (Modules 1 through 4). If state monies fund these other diversion programs wholly or in part, then a follow-up question asks about their effect on the funding of other state programs.

Can you highlight them for me (e.g. with the highlighter tool in Word/Adobe)? And while you’re at it, can you highlight any other questions that were added and which are referenced in the responses?

All changes to the telephone interview and site visit protocols made since the initial submission (dated August 15, 2007) have been highlighted.