

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
FOR PAPERWORK
REDUCTION ACT
SUBMISSIONS

LGBTQ Youth
Homelessness Prevention
Initiative:

Planning Phase Documentation Strategy
OMB PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT
SUBMISSION

Office of Special Needs Assistance Programs
Community Planning and Development
US Department of Housing and Urban
Development

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	i
Part A: Justification.....	1
A1. Need and Legal Basis.....	1
A2. Information Users.....	2
A3. Improved Information Technologies.....	4
A4. Duplication of Similar Information.....	4
A5. Small Business.....	4
A6. Less Frequent Data Collection.....	4
A7. Special Circumstances.....	5
A8. Federal Register Notice/Outside Consultation.....	5
A9. Payment/Gift to Respondents.....	5
A10. Confidentiality.....	5
A11. Sensitive Questions.....	5
A12. Burden Estimate (Total Hours and Wages).....	5
A13. Capital Costs.....	6
A14. Cost to the Federal Government.....	6
A15. Program or Burden Changes.....	6
A16. Publication and Tabulation Dates.....	7
A17. Expiration Date.....	7
A18. Certification Statement.....	7
Appendix A: Review Questions, Methods, and Data Sources.....	8

Part A: Justification

A1. Need and Legal Basis

Why is this information necessary? Identify any legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection.

The United States Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) set a goal to end homelessness among youth by 2020. To achieve this goal, communities will need to develop and implement strategies that respond to the experiences and needs of youth experiencing homelessness in their communities. Research has documented, for example, that approximately 20% to 40% of youth experiencing homelessness are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender (LGBT) or questioning (Q) their sexual orientation or gender identity (Ray, 2006). With this disparity in mind and to support USICH's 2020 goal, the U.S. Departments of Education, Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, and Justice, along with USICH and in partnership with the True Colors Fund, created the LGBTQ Youth Homelessness Prevention Initiative ("Initiative"). This Initiative began in two communities in March 2014 with a strategic planning process that ends on September 30, 2014. Beginning on October 1, 2014, both communities will begin to move forward with implementing their local plans. HUD and its partners provided extensive technical assistance to both communities to develop local plans that will reduce and prevent homelessness for LGBTQ youth at-risk of, or experiencing, non-chronic homelessness.

This Initiative emerged because LGBTQ youth are significantly overrepresented in the homeless youth population. Furthermore, systems and services designed to meet their needs and prevent homelessness are often lacking in communities. To inform national and local strategies that can address this disparity, the Initiative has five objectives:

- (1) To facilitate better local collaboration between stakeholders working with youth, including non-traditional partners such as libraries and local establishments;
- (2) To improve, through screening and assessment, identification of LGBTQ youth at risk of or experiencing episodic homelessness;
- (3) To identify, coordinate, and improve policies and interventions to prevent LGBTQ youth homelessness;
- (4) To reduce homelessness among LGBTQ youth and improve their outcomes in the areas of permanent connections, stable housing, education, employment, and well-being; and,
- (5) To inform national strategies for preventing homelessness among LGBTQ youth.

The Initiative is a multi-year endeavor occurring in Hamilton County (Cincinnati), Ohio and Harris County (Houston), Texas.

The purpose of this information collection is to document how the two communities have approached their planning process for this Initiative, including factors supporting and impeding planning as well as lessons learned. Analysis of this information will yield findings that can inform replication of the Initiative in other communities and will also produce documentation that will immediately guide implementation of the local plans. To support implementation of the local plans, the technical assistance team will share and discuss findings with the communities to ensure that findings and lessons learned are useful to and support the initiatives of both communities. Ultimately and importantly, this will contribute to the federal partners' and the youth homelessness prevention field's understanding of community change and the benefits of initiatives to prevent LGBTQ youth homelessness. The technical assistance team will submit a separate plan to frame an implementation phase evaluation.

This information collection is directly related to the improvement and implementation of two important HUD programs, the Continuum of Care Program, 24 CFR 578, and the Emergency Solutions Grant Program, 24 CFR 576. The primary purpose of these programs is to prevent and end homelessness in America but supporting grant recipients and communities of stakeholders, organized as continuums of care, with direct project funding and technical assistance.

A2. Information Users

How is the information collected and how is the information to be used?

The overarching review objectives are:

1. To document how two communities carried out the planning for their local LGBTQ homelessness prevention initiative, including their processes, tools, and resources used;
2. To identify the strengths/assets leveraged and challenges faced by the communities during the planning process; and,
3. To develop recommendations from lessons learned that will inform future planning efforts.

Our review and documentation of the Initiative planning processes will focus on nine areas. These include: (1) local leads, (2) timeline, (3) needs assessment, (4) logic model, (5) local plan development, (6) steering committee, (7) subcommittees, (8) community involvement, and (9) technical assistance supports. The nine areas were identified as critical components of the planning process based on the Initiative's guidance document and the approaches of the two communities. For example, both communities established steering committees and subcommittees to develop strategies for their local plans. The core review questions corresponding to these nine areas include:

1. How did local leads, steering committees, and subcommittees champion this initiative and what roles did they have in developing their local plans?
2. What planning timeline did the communities follow?
3. What needs assessments activities did the communities conduct and how was this information documented and used to inform planning?
4. How did the communities approach development of a local initiative logic model and what do their local logic models address?
5. How did the communities approach local plan development and what strategies do the local plans incorporate? Importantly, how do the plans address funding and sustainability?
6. In what ways were community stakeholders from diverse backgrounds engaged in the planning process and how did the communities develop core partnerships?
7. What technical assistance supported the two communities in their plan development?
8. What barriers/challenges hindered local plan development, and in what ways did the communities try to address them? For example, what hindered the roles of local leads.
9. What strengths/assets supported local plan development, and in what ways did the communities leverage them?

10. What lessons learned and recommendations do local stakeholders have for future planning efforts such as this one?

The core review questions were developed to understand and document how these components were approached and, where relevant, how they influenced the planning process. Importantly, the questions will help to identify challenges, strengths/assets, and lessons learned that can inform recommendations for other communities embarking on a similar planning process. Using the methods that follow, we will use this information to inform local practice in the two communities and efforts to end LGBTQ youth homelessness at the national level and other communities around the country.

The evaluation team will use both quantitative and qualitative methods to review and document the local planning processes. This mixed methods approach will allow us to gain a more complete understanding of themes across the two communities along with in-depth perspectives from a range of key stakeholders involved in the planning processes. Using multiple methods within the design also allows us to check for consistency across data sources and gain more meaningful and valuable findings. Each method will address most or all of the overarching nine areas of focus. Appendix A details the questions we propose including on interview, focus group, and survey instruments. The following information describes each of the methods we will employ to collect information for this review.

Interviews and Focus Groups

We will conduct interviews (approximately six in each community) and focus groups (two focus groups in each community with approximately six participants in each).¹ These methods will allow us to capture the perspectives of partners and other planning phase participants, including local leads, subcommittee members, and steering committee members. These qualitative methods will allow us to collect richer, more nuanced data than we could collect through a survey. Qualitative data will also provide insights into participants' experiences with their local planning efforts, including lessons learned. Through these methods, the evaluation team will be able to probe based on participant responses, leading to richer data that contribute to new insights. For interviews, we will develop semi-structured protocols that align with the core review questions. Each of these interviews will last approximately 60 minutes and will be used to gather information about the overall approaches to developing their local plans. Furthermore, focus groups will allow us to gather and better understand multiple stakeholder views and attitudes in one setting. Focus groups also allow for interaction between and among participants, often stimulating new or additional layers of shared thinking about an experience or thought. Our review will leverage the respective strengths of these methods.

Surveys

We will administer surveys to local leads (n=7), steering committee members (approximately 40 individuals), and subcommittee members (approximately 40 individuals) to quantify stakeholders' perspectives and experiences. Surveys are a less resource-intensive method for assessing a range of topics (e.g., attitudes) in a systematic way. Surveys will collect data on stakeholder involvement and perspectives on the initiative's timeline, steering committee, local leads, and technical assistance. Surveys for Steering Committee members will collect data on the members' involvement with and perspectives on initiative's timeline, logic model,

¹ Key informants selected for interviews will not be asked to participate in focus groups too.

workgroups/ subcommittees, community involvement, and technical assistance. Finally, surveys of subcommittee members will collect data on the members' involvement with and perspectives on timeline, logic model, workgroups/subcommittees, and community involvement.

Document Review

Lastly, a review of documents will provide another lens for understanding the local planning efforts and their outcomes. We will review Initiative-related documents including their plans to better understand how the two communities have approached the planning process and its results. For this review, the following documents will be examined: meeting agendas and notes, Groupsite materials (the initiative's communications and information sharing online community), local logic models, timelines, participant lists, and needs assessment summaries. An overview of review questions, organized by each of the nine areas of focus and linked to methods and data sources, follows (see Appendix A).

A3. Improved Information Technologies

Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information is automated (item 13b1 of OMB form 83-i).

Surveys will be conducted using an online platform. Participants will enter their responses into the system which will support collating and analysis functions. Use of this online system will streamline the data collection and analysis process, saving time and redundancy.

A4. Duplication of Similar Information

Is this information collected elsewhere? Review current information collection packages for potential consolidation.

This information will not be collected elsewhere. Quantitative and qualitative data, including surveys, focus group, interviews, and document review will be the only data collected to capture information about the Initiative's planning phase.

A5. Small Business

Does the collection of information impact small businesses or other small entities (item 5 of OMB form 83-i)? Describe any methods used to minimize burden.

No small businesses are involved as respondents to this data collection effort. Respondents are representatives from local and state governments and non-profit organizations.

A6. Less Frequent Data Collection

Why can't the information be collected less frequently – or not at all? Describe the consequence to Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently, as well as any technical or legal obstacles to reducing burden.

Interview, focus group, and survey data will be collected during a 60-day period. Less frequent (or no) data collection would significantly reduce the ability of HUD to assess the planning phase domains and would limit understanding of learned lessons, strengths, and challenges that occurred during the planning phase of this demonstration project. This knowledge can be helpful to provide insights for practice in the current communities and replication of LGBTQ youth homelessness prevention strategies in other communities.

A7. Special Circumstances

The proposed data collection activities are consistent with the guidelines set forth in 5 CFR 1320.6 (Controlling Paperwork Burden on the Public—General Information Collection Guidelines). There are no special circumstances that require deviation from these guidelines.

A8. Federal Register Notice/Outside Consultation

Identify the date and page number of the Federal Register notice (and provide a copy) soliciting comments on the information. Summarize public comments and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Describe all efforts to consult with persons outside the agency.

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Department of Housing and Urban Development published a notice in the Federal Register on July 25, 2014 (<https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2014/07/25/2014-17561/60-day-notice-of-proposed-information-collection>) announcing the agency's intention to request an OMB review of data collection activities for this review. The notice provided a 60-day period for public comments.

No comments were received.

A9. Payment/Gift to Respondents

Explain any payments or gifts to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.

No remuneration will be given to respondents.

A10. Confidentiality

Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents and the basis for assurance in statute, regulation or agency policy.

The methods will not collect any protected personal information.

A11. Sensitive Questions

Justify any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private.

Surveys, interviews, and focus groups will not include any questions of a sensitive nature.

A12. Burden Estimate (Total Hours and Wages)

Estimate public burden: number of respondents, frequency of response, annual hour burden. Explain how the burden was estimated.

Exhibits A-1 and A-2 below demonstrate how the public burden for this review was calculated based on estimated time and expenditures required to participate in the interviews, focus groups, and survey. The total burden for data collection from all participants over a six-month period is estimated at 62 hours or \$2,030.

Exhibit A-1: Estimated Annual Burden Hours for LGBTQ Planning Phase Documentation Review

A	B	C	D	E
Activity	Number of Respondents	Burden per Activity (Minutes)	Total Burden (Minutes)	Total Burden (Hours)*
			B*C	D/60
Interviews	13	60	780	13
Focus Group	24	60	1,440	24
Survey	100	15	1,500	25
TOTAL				62

Exhibit A-2: Estimated Annualized Cost per Respondent for LGBTQ Planning Phase Documentation Review

A	B	C	D
	Total Burden Hours	Hourly Wage Rate*	Total Respondent Costs
			B*C
Interviews, Focus Groups, Survey	62	\$32.74	\$2,030

*Hourly wage rates are based on the 2013 National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates by the Department of Labor (May 2013, http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/naics3_624000.htm). The hourly wage rate in Exhibit A-2 represents the mean hourly wage of "Social Assistance, Management Occupations."

A13. Capital Costs

Estimate the annual capital cost to respondents or record keepers.

There are no capital costs for respondents due to this data collection.

A14. Cost to the Federal Government

Estimate annualized costs to the Federal government.

The federal costs associated with this data collection is estimated at \$33,000 (300 hours), using an average hourly rate of \$110 for HUD-funded technical assistance providers.

A15. Program or Burden Changes

Explain any program changes or adjustments in burden.

This is a new information collection package.

A16. Publication and Tabulation Dates

If the information will be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication.

The analyses will lead to several products that will synthesize findings and will be shared to engage stakeholders. First, the evaluation team will produce a written report summarizing findings and recommendations. This report will document how each community has approached its planning process and related weaknesses/challenges, strengths/assets, and recommendations for other communities that might carry out a similar planning activity for preventing LGBTQ youth homelessness. The team will report key quantitative findings along with themes and patterns from the qualitative data. We will include de-identified quotes and useful examples from interviews and focus groups to support the findings and recommendations. Recommendation will address both suggestions for future planning processes in other communities as well as ideas for assessing the implementation phase and related outcomes. The team will share written copies of the report with the federal partners, both communities, and any person requesting it.

In addition to a written report, the team will brief the federal partners and the communities on findings and recommendations. We also recommend distributing findings through a national webinar, conference presentations, and dissemination of the replication guide through listservs and websites that will reach individuals interested in preventing LGBTQ youth homelessness. We will be careful about how these findings including planning processes are framed since we will not have gathered evidence on whether the initiative has met its goals. Together, the review design and reporting will engage a range of stakeholders in practical ways to improve their work and related outcomes.

A17. Expiration Date

Explain any request to not display the expiration date.

The OMB expiration date will be displayed on all data collection instruments. No exceptions are requested.

A18. Certification Statement

Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in item 19.

There are no exceptions to the certification.

Appendix A: Review Questions, Methods, and Data Sources

Questions	Interviews			Focus Groups		Surveys			Documents						
	Local leads	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Local leads	Steering Com	Subcommittees	Meeting agendas & notes	Committee	Topic materials	Local plan	Timeline	Participant lists	Needs assessment
1. Local Leads															
How were you selected to serve as the local lead? What factors influenced your selection as the lead organization?	X														
Approximately how many hours do you estimate you spent on the initiative planning process, by month? April: ____ May: ____ June: ____ July: ____ August: ____ September: ____						X									
Please summarize your role with the initiative. What kinds of activities and responsibilities did you take on as a local lead?	X														
If you were describing this initiative to another community, how would you describe the time commitment needed to lead your local planning process?	X														
What helped to support your role as a local lead?	X														
Did you have enough support? Why or why not? If not, what more could have been helpful?	X														
How did you approach managing the planning process and related coordination?	X														
What obstacles or challenges did you encounter, if any? How did you work to address and overcome these?	X														

Questions	Interviews			Focus Groups		Surveys			Documents						
	Local leads	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Local leads	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Meeting agendas & notes	Contracts	Topic materials	Local plan	Timeline	Participant lists	Needs assessment
Thinking about the time commitment and responsibilities of local leads only, what advice would you want to share with another community taking on a similar planning process?	X														
How would you describe the role of the local lead(s) for this initiative? What supports did they provide to the planning process? What capacities and skills did they bring to the planning process? Could the local leads have been more helpful and, if so, how?		X	X	X	X										
2. Timeline															
What steps did you take to develop your planning phase timeline? Who was involved? What informed your decisions about the schedule?	X	X							X				X		
How well did the timeline work? Please rate your agreement with the following statements: <i>The planning phase timeline we developed was appropriate for guiding our work.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree <i>We closely followed our planning phase timeline.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree	X					X	X	X							
What aspects of your timeline worked particularly well? What would you	X	X		X	X				X				X		

Questions	Interviews			Focus Groups		Surveys			Documents						
	Local leader	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Local leader	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Meeting agendas & notes	Minutes	Logic models	Local plan	Timeline	Participant lists	Needs assessment
have done differently if you were to start over?															
What recommendations do you have for other communities that are developing a timeline for a similar initiative?	X	X		X	X										
3. Needs Assessment															
How did your community assess its needs? What types of activities did your community carry out as part of the needs assessment? What sources of data did you collect? How did you analyze it? Are there additional needs assessment activities that would have been helpful?	X	X		X					X						X
Was conducting a needs assessment helpful to your community? How so? How was the information from the assessment used throughout the planning process? Are there additional ways that you wish you used the information?	X	X		X	X				X						X
Please rate your agreement with the following statement: <i>The needs assessment activities (e.g., interviews of key stakeholders, community forums) were helpful to informing our community's plan development.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Unsure						X	X								
4. Logic Model															
How did you develop your logic model? Who was involved? How did you engage your steering committee in logic model development? Subcommittees? The community? Was the initiative logic model helpful for developing your local model—and why or why not?	X								X		X				
Approximately how many hours were dedicated to logic model						X			X		X				

Questions	Interviews			Focus Groups		Surveys			Documents						
	Local leader	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Local leader	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Meeting agendas & notes	Minutes	Logic models	Local plan	Timeline	Participant lists	Needs assessment
development? __															
What recommendations do you have for other communities that are developing a logic model for a similar initiative?	X	X	X												
To what extent do you think your local logic model adequately reflects your initiative? Why or why not?	X	X	X												
Please rate your agreement with the following statement: <i>The logic model provides an accurate framework for our initiative.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Unsure						X	X	X							
5. Local Plan Development															
What strategies do the local plans include? To what extent do the local plans align with the initiative logic model and recommended priorities (e.g., USICH intervention model)?											X				
How did you develop your local plan? Who was involved? How did you engage your steering committee in local plan development? Subcommittees? The community?	X	X							X					X	
What support was most useful to you as you developed your local plan?	X	X		X	X										
Was there anything unique about your local community context that guided how the process evolved? [probe about local factors supporting/hindering the planning process]	X	X	X	X	X										
How has your community approached generating new resources or realigning funding to sustain the initiative locally? What other strategies, if any, have you used to sustain the initiative?	X	X													

Questions	Interviews			Focus Groups		Surveys			Documents						
	Local leader	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Local leader	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Meeting agendas & notes	Minutes	Topic materials	Local plan	Timeline	Participant lists	Needs assessment
What obstacles or challenges did you encounter, if any? How did you work to address and overcome these?	X	X		X											
To what extent do the written plans have strategies to realign or expand funding for the local initiative? How about strategies to sustain the initiative?												X			
What recommendations do you have for other communities that are developing a local plan for a similar initiative?	X	X		X	X										
To what extent are you satisfied with the content of your local plan? <input type="checkbox"/> Very satisfied <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat satisfied <input type="checkbox"/> A little satisfied <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all satisfied							X	X							
Please rate your agreement with the following statements: <i>Our community's initiative plan has the right strategies to prevent LGBTQ youth homelessness in our community.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree <i>Our community will be able to effectively sustain our initiative's plan.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree						X	X	X							
6. Steering Committee															
How did you determine who to include on the steering committee? How	X	X							X					X	

Questions	Interviews			Focus Groups		Surveys			Documents						
	Local leader	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Local leader	Steering Com	Subcommittees	Meeting agendas & notes	Minutes	Topic materials	Local plan	Timeline	Participant lists	Needs assessment
did you identify who was missing and engage them?															
How frequently did the steering committee meet? Were these meetings in person or by phone? How long were these meetings? How did the committee use this meeting time?	X	X				X	X		X					X	
How frequently did the steering committee meet? __April __May __June __July __August __September	X								X						
What expectations were established for how the steering committee participated in the planning process? How were they set? To what extent were they clear?	X	X	X	X	X										
Did the steering committee use technology such as online meeting rooms. Groupsite, listservs, etc.? How did you use technology as part of your work with the steering committee? What was most useful? What additional technology would have been helpful?	X	X		X					X	X				X	
How helpful was Groupsite for communicating and sharing information to support the planning process? <input type="checkbox"/> Very helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat helpful <input type="checkbox"/> A little helpful <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all helpful						X	X								
How did the steering committee interface with the workgroups? How did the subcommittees communicate with the steering committee and each	X	X	X	X	X				X						

Questions	Interviews			Focus Groups		Surveys			Documents						
	Local leader	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Local leader	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Meeting agendas & notes	Minutes	Topic materials	Local plan	Timeline	Participant lists	Needs assessment
other? What feedback loops were in place?															
What were the responsibilities of the steering committee members?	X	X		X											
Approximately how many hours of time per month did the steering committee role require? __April __May __June __July __August __September							X								
Was the time burden for your participation in the planning realistic?				X											
7. Subcommittees															
What subcommittees were established? How were their areas of focus identified?	X	X							X						
How were the subcommittee chairs selected? What were their responsibilities?	X	X		X					X					X	
Was the time required to contribute to subcommittees reasonable?				X	X										
Approximately how many hours of time per month did the subcommittee role require? __April __May __June __July __August __September								X							

Questions	Interviews			Focus Groups		Surveys			Documents						
	Local leads	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Local leads	Steering Com	Subcommittees	Meeting agendas & notes	Minutes	Topic materials	Local plan	Timeline	Participant lists	Needs assessment
<p>Please rate your agreement with the following statements:</p> <p><i>The time commitment for subcommittee chairs was reasonable.</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree <p><i>The time commitment for members was reasonable.</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree															
How were subcommittee members selected? What were their responsibilities?	X	X	X	X	X				X					X	
What expectations were established for how the subcommittee members participated in the planning process? How were they set? To what extent were they clear?	X	X	X	X	X										
How frequently did the subcommittees meet on average? How did they meet (e.g., in person or by phone)? How long were the meetings, typically? How frequently did the subcommittees meet?		X	X						X						
How did subcommittees use their time? To what extent were subcommittee meetings productive and a good use of participants' time?		X	X												
<p>Please rate your agreement with the following statements.</p> <p><i>Subcommittee meetings were useful to our planning phase process</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree				X	X		X	X							

Questions	Interviews			Focus Groups		Surveys			Documents						
	Local leads	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Local leads	Steering Com	Subcommittees	Meeting agendas & notes	Minutes	Topic materials	Local plan	Timeline	Participant lists	Needs assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree <i>Time during the subcommittee meetings was well structured.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree Comment: <i>The subcommittee meetings were productive.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree															
What technology was most useful to you during your subcommittee work? What was least useful? What additional technology would have been helpful?	X	X	X	X	X										
How was collaboration encouraged across subcommittees?	X	X		X	X				X						
What supported subcommittee chair and member efforts?	X	X	X	X	X										
What obstacles or challenges did subcommittee chairs and members encounter, if any? How did they work to address and overcome these?	X	X	X	X	X										
8. Community Involvement															
How did you determine which stakeholders to engage at the community level? What did their involvement look like?	X	X		X											
How were partnerships developed? With whom?	X														

Questions	Interviews			Focus Groups		Surveys			Documents						
	Local leads	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Local leads	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Meeting agendas & notes	Minutes	Topic materials	Local plan	Timeline	Participant lists	Needs assessment
Were the right stakeholders engaged and key organizations represented during the planning process? How about youth and families? Why or why not?	X	X		X	X									X	
Please rate your agreement with the following statements: <i>The right individuals were engaged in the planning phase.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Comment: <i>The right organizations were engaged in the planning phase.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Comment:							X	X							
For those who were missing, why do you think they were missing/what were the barriers to participation? To what extent did you try to engage important people/organizations who were missing? And if they were engaged, through what strategies (e.g., number of calls, emails)?	X														
9. Technical Assistance															
How did the core TA team help to support the development of your community plan? What types of support did it provide?	X	X		X	X										
Please rate your agreement with the following statements: <i>The TA team provided useful supports to us during the development of</i>						X	X								

Questions	Interviews			Focus Groups		Surveys			Documents						
	Local leader	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Local leader	Steering Com	Subcommittees	Meeting agendas & notes	Minutes	Topic materials	Local plan	Timeline	Participant lists	Needs assessment
<p><i>our community plan.</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree Comment:															
<p><i>I felt supported by the TA team during the planning phase.</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/> Strong Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree Comment:															
What other supports did you access outside of the core TA team? Why did you choose to access these supports?	X	X		X	X										
What aspects of the TA team's support were most useful to you during the planning phase?						X	X	X							
What aspects of the TA team's support were least useful to you during the planning phase?						X	X	X							
What additional technical assistance support would have been helpful to you during the planning phase?						X	X	X							
Please rate your agreement with the following statements: <i>We could have developed our community plan without the assistance of the TA team.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree						X	X								

Questions	Interviews			Focus Groups		Surveys			Documents						
	Local leader	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Local leader	Steering Com.	Subcommittees	Meeting agendas & notes	Minutes	Topic materials	Local plan	Timeline	Participant lists	Needs assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree Comment: <i>The TA team's support was a significant support for developing our community plan</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly Disagree Comment:															
10. Lessons Learned															
Thinking about the planning period and process overall, what key lessons learned would you want to share with another community embarking on a similar initiative?	X	X	X	X	X										
If you were to go through this process again, is there anything you would you do differently?	X	X	X	X	X										
11. Moving Forward															
What technical assistance supports will your community need to successfully implement and sustain its plan?	X	X	X	X	X										
What worries you about your plan implementation? That is, anything that concerns you about your community's ability to successfully carry out the plan?	X	X	X	X	X										
What excites you most about your plan implementation?	X	X	X	X	X										