Evaluation of the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers

OMB Clearance Request for Data Collection Instruments

Part A: Supporting Statement for Paperwork Reduction Act Submission

December 17, 2014

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Education
Contract No. ED-IES-13-C-0059

Prepared by:

IMPAQ International

INTRODUCTION

This document has been prepared to support the clearance of data collection instruments for the National Evaluation of the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers. The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) within the U.S Department of Education (ED) is conducting this evaluation. In the introduction to the supporting statement, we provide a description of the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers program, the evaluation questions and study design. The remaining sections of this document respond to specific instructions of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for the preparation of a supporting statement.

This document describes a request for clearance of six data collection instruments for phase one of the evaluation: 1) Design-focused Interview Guide for Center Staff, 2) Implementation-focused Interview Guide for Center Staff, 3) Interview Guide for Technical Assistance (TA) Recipients, 4) Center Staff Survey, 5) TA Recipient Survey, and 6) TA Event Observation Guide. A separate, phase 2 proposal will be submitted at a later date for clearance of outcomes-focused data collection instruments, including interview protocols for Comprehensive Center Staff and TA recipients. The outcome-focused protocols and their related burden hours will be submitted to OMB as a Phase 2 package after the first data collection site visits are complete.

The Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers

Title II of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 (F.T AA, Section 203)[1] authorized the Comprehensive Center (CC) Program, a discretionary grant program establishing technical assistance centers. The CCs were last awarded in 2012, to "provide technical assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs) that builds their capacity to support local educational agencies (LEAs or districts) and schools, especially low-performing districts and schools; improve educational outcomes for all students; close achievement gaps; and improve the quality of instruction" (77 FR 33564)[2].

In 2012, the Department of Education awarded new five-year grants to 15 Regional Centers and 7 Content Centers under the CC program. The Regional Centers each serve one to seven U.S. states, territories, and possessions. They provide technical assistance (TA) that builds the capacity of SEAs to implement, support, scale up, and sustain initiatives that help districts and schools improve student outcomes. The Regional Centers focus their work on seven Federal priority areas:

1. Implementing college- and career-ready standards and aligned, high-quality assessments for all students;
2. Identifying, recruiting, developing, and retaining highly effective teachers and leaders;
3. Turning around the lowest-performing schools;

---

[1] http://www2.ed.gov/programs/newccp/legislation.html
[2] https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2012/06/06/2012-13735/applications-for-new-awards-comprehensive-centers-program#h-4

4. Ensuring the school readiness and success of preschool-age children and their successful transition to kindergarten;
5. Building rigorous instructional pathways that support the successful transition of all students from secondary education to college without the need for remediation, and careers;
6. Identifying and scaling up innovative approaches to teaching and learning that significantly improve student outcomes; and
7. Using data-based decision-making to improve instructional practices, policies, and student outcomes.

The Content Centers provide the Regional Centers and SEAs with in-depth content knowledge and expertise by providing information, publications, tools, and specialized technical assistance. The 7 Content Centers are:

1. Center on Standards and Assessments Implementation
2. Center on Great Teachers and Leaders
3. Center on School Turnaround
4. Center on Enhancing Early Learning Outcomes
5. Center on College and Career Readiness and Success
6. Center on Building State Capacity and Productivity
7. Center on Innovations in Learning

The National Evaluation of the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers

The National Evaluation is charged with examining and documenting how the individual CCs intend to build SEA capacity (referred to as *theories of action*) and what types of activities they actually conduct to build capacity. It is designed to build on the previous evaluation of the CCs, which documented the type, extent, and quality of services provided.

Evaluation Questions

The evaluation will address broad questions in three areas:

- **Program Design: How did the CCs design their work?** In addressing this evaluation question, we seek to identify how the CCs designed their work as TA providers, including the underlying theories of action driving the work. The evaluation will seek to surface the theories of action and definitions of capacity building employed by CCs, as well as describe CCs' plans for assessing the needs of their constituencies and developing TA work plans to address those needs.
- **Program Implementation: How did the CCs operate?** In addressing this evaluation question, we seek to identify the various strategies CCs used to build capacity, describe the characteristics of those strategies, and document the extent to which CCs implemented the TA as planned. We will also seek to identify the common challenges and barriers CCs faced in building capacity, and ways they met those challenges.
- **Program Outcomes: What was the result of the CCs' work?** In addressing this evaluation question, we seek to identify the extent to which CCs achieved their goals and objectives, particularly as they relate to building their constituents' capacity. We

will also explore the extent to which outcomes aligned with and supported the CCs' theories of action, and identify factors that may have contributed to CCs' success (or failure) in achieving expected outcomes.

Focus on Two Federal Priority Areas

As a way to focus the evaluation to gather data in depth rather than breadth, the evaluation will limit data collection on the implementation and outcomes questions to two of the seven federal priority areas:

1. Identifying, recruiting, developing, and retaining highly effective teachers and leaders, and
2. Ensuring the school readiness and success of preschool-age children and their successful transition to kindergarten.

These two priority areas were purposefully selected. First, **effective teachers and leaders** is a topic area in which all of the Regional Centers have ongoing projects. In addition, this is a topic area where most SEAs have significant TA and capacity building needs, as many are choosing and implementing educator evaluation systems or supporting districts and schools as they hire and evaluate their professional staff. This priority is also tied to school reform efforts and large federal funding streams such as the Race to the Top initiative, the School Improvement Grants, and the Teacher Incentive Fund.

The second priority area, **early learning**, is another high-profile topic which has recently gained increased attention. In response to federal initiatives and research findings on the benefits of high-quality early education, many states have increased their funding for state-supported early childhood education programs over last few years. This evaluation is well poised to examine the role that the CCs play in supporting state efforts in this priority area.

Given the overarching nature of the effective teachers and leaders priority, and the recent policy focus on early learning efforts, we believe that focusing on these two priorities will allow us to learn about how CCs develop SEA capacity (and in the case of Content Centers, both SEA and Regional Center capacity) in these two areas and what difference the CCs' efforts have made. Further, we believe that SEAs' capacity building needs and the CCs' approach to providing TA in these two priorities may differ across Centers in meaningful ways. These differences are likely to produce different types of capacity building outcomes (i.e., the needs and approach to building capacity to develop great teachers and leaders may be different than the needs and approach to building capacity related to early learning initiatives). Thus, by selecting these two priorities, we may learn more about the variety of needs and the ways the CCs address those needs, as well as their outcomes.

The selection of two priority areas in no way implies that the Department has a preference for these areas over others, or that the centers or SEAs should shift the focus of their efforts to these areas. Rather, this narrowing of focus allows us to target our resources in such a way that we are able to learn more about specific capacity building activities and outcomes.

Data collection for this study will consist of surveys of TA recipients, interviews of SEA staff, surveys and interviews of CC staff, and observations of TA events.

TA recipient surveys

- Purpose: To gather information about TA received in selected priority areas from the CCs, understand the actions resulting from participating in TA, and examine outcomes related to that TA
- Sample: All SEA and possibly district staff who received TA from the CCs in the selected priority areas, along with Regional Center staff receiving TA from Content Centers
- Timing: Once yearly, beginning in the first quarter of 2015 (following OMB approval)

CC staff and SEA interviews

- Purpose: To gather information about the Centers' capacity building efforts, theories of action, program implementation, and outcomes;
- Sample: A purposeful sample of Center Directors, Managers, Evaluators, and TA staff; Recipients of CC TA, including SEA and possibly LEA staff, and other CCs;
- Timing: In coordination with site visits (projected to occur in Q2 2015).

CC staff surveys

- Purpose: To gather information from multiple CC TA staff about the nature, successes and challenges of their work building SEA capacity or Regional Center capacity, and to help identify high-leverage projects for more detailed study;
- Sample: All Center staff providing TA;
- Timing: Once yearly, beginning in the first quarter of 2015 (following OMB approval).

TA event observations

- Purpose: To obtain detailed data about the strategies that CCs used to support capacity building and achieve planned outcomes;
- Sample: Observable services or events that are planned for the selected priority areas in profiled projects, or projects that are potential profiled projects;
- Timing: In coordination with site visits if possible, except for virtual events such as webinars, which will be observed as they occur.

Evaluation reports

The evaluation will produce four reports. The first report will be an interim report focusing on how the CCs designed their work as technical assistance providers. The report will describe the CCs' underlying theories of action and definitions of "capacity building," and explain how the Centers assessed their constituencies' needs and developed work plans to address those needs. This report will be available in the first quarter of 2016.

Two interim summative reports (projected date: first quarter 2017) will be produced to address the program implementation and outcomes questions, one report for each of the two selected priority areas. These reports will demonstrate how and to what extent the Comprehensive

Technical Assistance Center program has built state capacity in these priority areas. The reports will include descriptions of the strategies used to build SEA capacity, common challenges faced and ways the CCs sought to address them, the extent to which CCs achieved their goals and objectives, factors that may have contributed to success (or failure) in achieving expected outcomes, and the extent to which CCs' outcomes aligned with and supported their theories of action. The interim summative reports will also include six profiles of multi-year projects, which will be selected and analyzed to illustrate how the CCs have successfully worked to build capacity related to project design and planning, implementation, and outcomes.

A final report will be produced in September 2018. The final report will summarize findings documented in the interim reports and update findings based on new data. The report shall provide a full summary of lessons learned on the CCs' efforts to build capacity.

PART A. JUSTIFICATION

1. **Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection. Attach a hard copy of the appropriate section of each statute and regulation mandating or authorizing the collection of information, or you may provide a valid URL link or paste the applicable section[3]. Specify the review type of the collection (new, revision, extension, reinstatement with change, reinstatement without change).**

Title II of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 (Section 204)[4] requires that the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), a component of the Department's Institute of Education Sciences (IES), provide for ongoing independent evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers. The statute establishes the following specific goals for the evaluation: to analyze the services provided by the Centers; to determine the extent to which each of the Centers meets the objectives of its respective plan; and to determine whether the services offered by each Center meet the educational needs of SEAs, local educational agencies (LEAs), and schools in the region.

In October 2013, IES contracted with IMPAQ International to evaluate the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers. This is a new data collection.

2. **Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used. Except for a new collection, indicate the actual use the agency has made of the information received from the current collection.**

The evaluation will provide the Department of Education and the CCs with a formative report about how the CCs designed and carried out their work, and summative reports on program implementation and outcomes. In doing so, the evaluation seeks to inform CC staff, the Department of Education, and the larger field about the capacity building strategies and

---

[3] Please limit pasted text to no longer than 3 paragraphs.
[4] http://www2.ed.gov/programs/newccp/legislation.html

outcomes of the CCs' work. The evaluation will inform ED's staff as they support the CC and the CCs themselves as they implement their work.

3. **Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or forms of information technology, e.g. permitting electronic submission of responses, and the basis for the decision of adopting this means of collection. Also describe any consideration given to using technology to reduce burden.**

Electronic technology will be used whenever possible to reduce the time burden on respondents. TA recipient and CC staff surveys will be administered online using an automated survey administration and data collection system. Online surveys are a proven, cost-effective data collection methodology that take less time to complete than paper or telephone surveys. In addition to enabling respondents to complete the survey at a time of their choosing, this method will allow the project team to monitor the survey response rate in real time and send customized, timely reminder emails.

4. **Describe efforts to identify duplication. Show specifically why any similar information already available cannot be used or modified for use for the purposes described in Item 2 above.**

This study will yield unique data to evaluate the CCs. The evaluation will make use of data and documents already collected, produced, or maintained by the CCs and their local evaluators. Whenever possible, information will be collected and reviewed prior to interviews in order to avoid unnecessary interview questions. This study involves questions in surveys and interviews that are distinct from those asked by local evaluators.

5. **If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small entities, describe any methods used to minimize burden.**

One CC is operated by a small business entity, and several CCs have small business partners. The evaluation team will minimize burden on these entities by scheduling interviews at the convenience of staff and coordinating data collection schedules with local evaluators to avoid multiple collections.

6. **Describe the consequences 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.**

Failure to collect the data proposed through this study would breach the legislative mandate in Title II of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 (Section 204) that requires NCEE to provide for ongoing independent evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers. It would also prevent ED from gaining an in-depth understanding of what capacity building strategies CCs are using and the outcomes of the CCs' work. Understanding the strategies that the CCs implement and whether the CCs achieved their expected outcomes will enable federal policy makers and program managers to monitor the program and provide useful guidance to CCs.

7. **Explain any special circumstances that would cause an information collection to be conducted in a manner:**
   - **requiring respondents to report information to the agency more often than quarterly;**
   - **requiring respondents to prepare a written response to a collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it;**
   - **requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document;**
   - **requiring respondents to retain records, other than health, medical, government contract, grant-in-aid, or tax records for more than three years;**
   - **in connection with a statistical survey, that is not designed to produce valid and reliable results than can be generalized to the universe of study;**
   - **requiring the use of a statistical data classification that has not been reviewed and approved by OMB;**
   - **that includes a pledge of confidentiality that is not supported by authority established in statute or regulation, that is not supported by disclosure and data security policies that are consistent with the pledge, or that unnecessarily impedes sharing of data with other agencies for compatible confidential use; or**
   - **requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secrets, or other confidential information unless the agency can demonstrate that it has instituted procedures to protect the information's confidentiality to the extent permitted by law.**

None of the special circumstances listed apply to this data collection.

8. **If applicable, provide a copy and identify the date and page number of publication in the Federal Register (FR) of the agency's notice, required by 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Specifically address comments received on cost and hour burden.**

   Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instruction and record keeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.

   Consultation with representatives of those from whom information is to be obtained or those who must compile records should occur at least once every 3 years - even if the collection of information activity is the same as in prior periods. There may be circumstances that may preclude consultation in a specific situation. These circumstances should be explained.

The 60 day FR notice was published on October 1, 2014 and the 30 day FR notice will be prepared and published as required. To date, there has been one comment, in support of the evaluation. The study team consulted with members of its technical working group (TWG) in developing the data collection instruments and data collection plans.

9. **Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees with meaningful justification.**

There are no payments or gifts associated with this study.

10. **Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents and the basis for the assurance in statute, regulation, or agency policy. If personally identifiable information (PII) is being collected, a Privacy Act statement should be included on the instrument. Please provide a citation for the Systems of Record Notice and the date a Privacy Impact Assessment was completed as indicated on the IC Data Form. A confidentiality statement with a legal citation that authorizes the pledge of confidentiality should be provided.[5] If the collection is subject to the Privacy Act, the Privacy Act statement is deemed sufficient with respect to confidentiality. If there is no expectation of confidentiality, simply state that the Department makes no pledge about the confidentially of the data.**

Every effort will be made to ensure that the responses of the TA recipients and CC staff who are surveyed and interviewed will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law as well as by the design of the evaluation. Survey data will be stored on the evaluation contractor's server that is protected by a firewall that monitors and evaluates all attempted connections from the Internet. Personal information (name, telephone number, and e-mail address) on each survey response will be maintained in a separate data file apart from the survey data so that individuals outside of the evaluation team cannot link particular responses to individual respondents. Once the contract is completed, all personal information on each survey respondent will be destroyed. The entire survey database will be encrypted so that any data stored will be further protected. Finally, access to any data with identifying information will be limited only to evaluation team members directly working on the survey. Survey findings will be presented at a level of aggregation such that it will not be possible to link specific responses to individual respondents.

Everything that is discussed during interviews will be used only for the purposes of this study. Information collected for this study comes under the confidentiality and data protection requirements of the Institute of Education Sciences (The Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, Title I, Part E, Section 183). Responses to this data collection will be used only for research purposes. The reports prepared for this study from the survey data will include information that is summarized and aggregated and should not associate responses with a specific Center, state, district or individual. Findings from the interview data will also be reported in summary form and individuals will not be identified by name. However, due to the

---

[5] Requests for this information are in accordance with the following ED and OMB policies: Privacy Act of 1974, OMB Circular A-108 – Privacy Act Implementation – Guidelines and Responsibilities, OMB Circular A-130 Appendix I – Federal Agency Responsibilities for Maintaining Records About Individuals, OMB M-03-22 – OMB Guidance for Implementing the Privacy Provisions of the E-Government Act of 2002, OMB M-06-15 – Safeguarding Personally Identifiable Information, OM:6-104 – Privacy Act of 1974 (Collection, Use and Protection of Personally Identifiable Information)

uniqueness of each Center and descriptions of particular projects in the reports, some Centers and/or states may be identifiable to readers. Also, respondents' roles and the Center they work with may be identified in the report, which may lead to individuals' being identified. Other than this situation that we will make respondents aware of, we will not provide information that identifies respondents to anyone outside the study team, except as required by law.

Interview notes or recordings will not be shared with ED staff or anyone else outside the study team. Paper copies of interview notes will be secured in a locked file cabinet. Electronic copies of notes will be stored in a SQL Server database located in the contractor's access-controlled server room.

11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private. The justification should include the reasons why the agency considers the questions necessary, the specific uses to be made of the information, the explanation to be given to persons from whom the information is requested, and any steps to be taken to obtain their consent.

There are no data of a sensitive, personal, or private nature being collected in the surveys or interviews.

12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information.

Exhibit 1 shows the estimated burden hours and estimated monetary burden for respondents for each instrument to be administered in this study. Exhibit 2 displays the estimates of annualized costs by respondent type. Because of the site development work previously accomplished, and given that under their cooperative agreement the CCs are required to provide data for evaluation purposes, the evaluation team anticipates a 100 percent response rate for the CC staff interviews and a 90 percent response rate for the CC staff surveys. Based on our experience, we expect an 80 percent response rate for the TA recipient surveys and an 80 percent response rate for the SEA staff interviews.

The CC staff survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete, including the time for reading our introductory letter and directions. The TA recipient survey will take about 15 minutes to complete. Interviews with Center and SEA staff and will last about 60 minutes. We plan to do a maximum of 10 TA observations per year from 2015 – 2017. For each observation, we anticipate the burden time to be 10 minutes for CC staff to provide us with any pertinent information or answer questions we might have about the observation (e.g., what are the objectives of the event being observed?). The total burden hours are estimated at 996. To estimate the time required for each type of data collection, we consulted with fewer than 10 IMPAQ staff members or CC staff members.

CC staff respondents are private sector employees in nonprofit or for-profit companies, or in universities. TA recipient respondents are employees of a state department of education or a local education agency such as a school district.

Data Collection Activity	Total Sample Size	Estimated Response Rate	Number of Respondents	Number of Administrations	Total Number of Responses	Time Estimate (in hours)	Total Hour Burden	Hourly Rate	Estimated Monetary Cost of Burden
Design-Focused Interviews with CC staff	88	100%	88	1	88	1	88	$45	$3,960
Implementation-Focused Interview with CC Staff	132	100%	132	2	264	1	264	$45	$11,880
Interviews with TA recipients	88	80%	70	2	140	1	140	$45	$6,300
CC Staff Survey	264	90%	238	3	714	0.33	235	$45	$10,575
TA Recipient Survey	440	80%	352	3	1056	0.25	264	$45	$11,880
TA Observation	10	100%	10	3	30	0.17	5	$45	$225
Totals					2292		996		$44,820

Exhibit 1: Estimated Burden Hours

Note: The outcomes-focused interview protocol will be developed after the first site visit and is not included in this package. The burden table will be updated when the outcomes-focused protocol is sent for review.

Because some individuals will give more than one response per year (all CC staff and TA recipient participants will be surveyed and a subset will also be interviewed and/or observed), the total number of respondents is estimated to be 590. Annually, we anticipate that participants will provide 764 responses. The annual burden hours are estimated to be 332.

Exhibit 2: Estimate of Annualized Costs by Respondent Type (Total for 3 Years and Per Year)

Respondent Type	Total Cost	Annualized Cost
CC Staff	$26,640	$8,880
TA Recipients	$18,180	$6,060
Total	$44,820	$14,940

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to respondents or record keepers resulting from the collection of information. (Do not include the cost of any hour burden shown in Items 12 and 14.)

There are no direct costs to respondents other than that of their time of participation. There will be no start-up or ongoing financial costs incurred by respondents.

14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government. Also, provide a description of the method used to estimate cost, which should include quantification of hours, operational expenses (such as equipment, overhead, printing, and support staff), and any other expense that would not have been incurred without this collection of information. Agencies also may aggregate cost estimates from Items 12, 13, and 14 in a single table.

The estimated cost for this study, including development of a detailed study design and data collection instruments, management of a Technical Working Group, preparation of a justification package, data collection, data analysis, and report preparation, is $7,861,244 for the five years, or an average of $1,572,244 per year. Estimated cost includes staff and consultant time, travel, and operational expenses.

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments. Generally, adjustments in burden result from re-estimating burden and/or from economic phenomenon outside of an agency's control (e.g., correcting a burden estimate or an organic increase in the size of the reporting universe). Program changes result from a deliberate action that materially changes a collection of information and generally are result of new statute or an agency action (e.g., changing a form, revising regulations, redefining the respondent universe, etc.). Burden changes should be disaggregated by type of change (i.e., adjustment, program change due to new statute, and/or program change due to agency discretion), type of collection (new, revision, extension, reinstatement with change, reinstatement without change) and include totals for changes in burden hours, responses and costs (if applicable).

This request is for a new information collection. Because this is a new collection, there is a program change (due to agency discretion) of 332 burden hours to report.

16. For collections of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication. Address any complex analytical techniques that will be used. Provide the time schedule for the entire project, including beginning and ending dates of the collection of information, completion of report, publication dates, and other actions.

16.1   Tabulation
The timeline for project data collection and reporting is in Exhibit 3. Data collection will begin in 2015 as soon as OMB approval is obtained and conclude in the fourth quarter of 2017. No complex analytical techniques will be used. For quantitative survey and observation data, we will use descriptive statistics and analysis of variance.

Exhibit 3: Timeline of Data Collection and Reporting

Tasks and Activities	Year 1					Year 2				Year 3				Year 4				Year 5		
	2013	2014				2015				2016				2017				2018		
	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3
Surveys (TA recipient and CC staff)																				
Administer TA recipient and CC staff surveys						*			■				■							
Interviews (TA recipient and CC staff)																				
Conduct interviews of TA recipients and CC staff							*		■				■							
Observations																				
Conduct observations of profiled projects as opportunities arise							*	■	■	■	■	■	■							
Formative report																				
Draft report on Center designs/ theories of action								■												
Final report on Center designs/theories of action										■										
Summative reports																				
Draft reports on implementation and outcomes														■						
Final reports on implementation and outcomes																	■			
Draft final summative report																			Apr	
Final summative report																				Sep

*Or upon OMB approval

13

16.2 Publication

The evaluation will produce four reports. The first report will be an interim report focusing on how the CCs designed their work as technical assistance providers. The report will describe the CCs' underlying theories of action and definitions of "capacity building," and explain how the Centers assessed their constituencies' needs and developed work plans to address those needs. This report will be available in early 2016.

Two interim summative reports (projected date: March 2017) will be produced to address the program implementation and outcomes questions, one report for each of the two selected priority areas. These reports will demonstrate how and to what extent the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Center program has built state capacity in these priority areas. The reports will include descriptions of the strategies used to build SEA capacity, common challenges faced and ways the CCs sought to address them, the extent to which CCs achieved their goals and objectives, factors that may have contributed to success (or failure) in achieving expected outcomes, and the extent to which CCs' outcomes aligned with and supported their theories of action. The interim summative reports will also include six profiles of multi-year projects, which will be selected and analyzed to illustrate how the CCs have successfully worked to build capacity related to project design and planning, implementation, and outcomes.

A final report will be produced in September 2018. The final report will summarize findings documented in the interim reports and update findings based on new data. The report shall provide a full summary of lessons learned on the CCs' efforts to build capacity.

17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons that display would be inappropriate.

The OMB approval number and expiration date will be displayed or cited on all information collection instruments.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in the Certification of Paperwork Reduction Act.

There are no exceptions taken to item 19 of OMB Form 83-1.