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CLUSTER MANAGER/ETA FUNDING STREAM ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

May 2014

**A. GENERAL INFORMATION**

Please complete this background information about yourself and the organization you represent in the cluster.

1. Your name:

2. Your title:

3. Organization Name:

4. Organization Type:

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

 1 □ K–12 educational institution

 2 □ Community college

 3 □ Four-year college or graduate school

 4 □ For-profit educational institution

 5 □ Workforce development agency

 6 □ Economic development agency

 7 □ WIB

 8 □ Chamber of Commerce

 9 □ Nonprofit organization

10 □ Trade association

11 □ Utility

12 □ Military

13 □ Local government

14 □ Tribal government

15 □ State government

16 □ Small business

17 □ Disadvantaged business

18 □ Other private, for-profit business

19 □ Employer group

20 □ Venture capital organization

99 □ Other *(specify)*

5. How long has your organization been involved with the cluster consortium that received this JIAC grant?

| | | years | | | months

**B. CLUSTER AND ENVIRONMENT**

This group of questions is about the cluster consortium that received the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant, and your role in it.

6. What have your roles as the cluster consortium manager and the ETA funding stream administrator entailed?

| MARK ALL THAT APPLY. | **Cluster Manager** | **ETA Administrator** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Interacting with staff from federal funding agencies  | 1 □ | 1 □ |
| b. Interacting with other federal agency staff  | 2 □ | 2 □ |
| c. Interacting with technical assistance contractor (Coffey Consulting)  | 3 □ | 3 □ |
| d. Interacting with the WIB or WIA administrative staff  | 4 □ | 4 □ |
| e. Explaining grant requirements to grantees and partners  | 5 □ | 5 □ |
| f. Explaining allowable fund expenditures to grantees and partners  | 6 □ | 6 □ |
| g. Identifying/Seeking matching and/or leveraged funds  | 7 □ | 7 □ |
| h. Identifying training needs of the cluster partners  | 8 □ | 8 □ |
| i. Connecting cluster partners with each other  | 9 □ | 9 □ |
| j. Recruiting new cluster partners  | 10 □ | 10 □ |
| k. Conducting outreach to potential partners from historically underrepresented organizations  | 11 □ | 11 □ |
| l. Developing relationships with research institutions  | 12 □ | 12 □ |
| m. Developing international relationships  | 13 □ | 13 □ |
| n. Developing relationships with credentialing and licensing organizations  | 14 □ | 14 □ |
| o. Facilitating technology transfer  | 15 □ | 15 □ |
| p. Increasing awareness of the cluster among business/industry  | 16 □ | 16 □ |
| q. Increasing awareness of the cluster among educational institutions  | 17 □ | 17 □ |
| r. Increasing awareness of the cluster in the workforce system  | 18 □ | 18 □ |
| s. Increasing awareness of the cluster among the public  | 19 □ | 19 □ |
| t. Other *(specify)*   | 99 □ | 99 □ |

7. To what extent have stakeholders in your region adopted collaboration as a strategy for economic development?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To a large extent |  | Somewhat |  | Not at all |
| 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |

8. Are there active collaborations in your region that focus on sectors, issues, or populations besides those targeted in your JIAC/AM-JIAC grant?

 1 □ Yes (*Please describe*)

 0 □ No

9. Did the cluster consortium, i.e. the collaborative partnerships, exist prior to the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant?

Mark all that apply

 1 □ Yes, and it has not changed much during the grant period

 2 □ Yes, but it was smaller or had fewer partners before the grant

 3 □ Yes, but it was larger or had more partners before the grant

 4 □ Yes, but it was less organized/weaker

 5 □ Yes, but it was more organized/stronger

 0 □ No, the cluster formed for/because of this grant **SKIP TO 11.5**

10. Which types of organizations were involved in the cluster consortium prior to the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant?

**MARK ALL THAT APPLY**

 1 □ K–12 educational institution

 2 □ Community college

 3 □ Four-year college or graduate school

 4 □ For-profit educational institution

 5 □ Workforce development agency

 6 □ Economic development agency

 7 □ WIB

 8 □ Chamber of Commerce

 9 □ Nonprofit organization

10 □ Trade association

11 □ Utility

12 □ Military

13 □ Local government

14 □ Tribal government

15 □ State government

16 □ National governments

17 □ Small business

18 □ Disadvantaged business

19 □ Other private, for-profit business

20 □ Employer groups

21 □ Venture capital organizations

99 □ Other *(specify)*

11. For each of the characteristics below, please rate your cluster consortium’s strength prior to the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant.

|  | SELECT ONE RESPONSE PER ROW |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Strength Prior to Grant** |
|  | Very Strong | Very Weak |
| a. Ability to access funding sources  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| b. Networking between cluster partners  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| c. Willingness to include new partners in cluster  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| d. Existence of a common purpose and vision  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| e. Membership of historically underrepresented businesses and organizations in cluster  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| f. Outreach by cluster to underrepresented groups of program participants  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| g. Relationships with educational and/or training institutions  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| h. Relationships with licensing and credentialing organizations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| i. Relationships with research and development organizations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| j. Awareness of the cluster among employers  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| k. Awareness of the cluster among job seekers  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| l. Awareness of the cluster in the workforce system  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| m. Awareness of the cluster in the industry beyond the local region  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |

11.5 For each of the characteristics below, please rate your cluster consortium’s strength currently.

|  | SELECT ONE RESPONSE PER ROW |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Strength Currently** |
|  | Very Strong | Very Weak |
| a. Ability to access funding sources  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| b. Networking between cluster partners  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| c. Willingness to include new partners in cluster  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| d. Existence of a common purpose and vision  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| e. Membership of historically underrepresented businesses and organizations in cluster  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| f. Outreach by cluster to underrepresented groups of program participants  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| g. Relationships with educational and/or training institutions  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| h. Relationships with licensing and credentialing organizations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| i. Relationships with research and development organizations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| j. Awareness of the cluster among employers  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| k. Awareness of the cluster among job seekers  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| l. Awareness of the cluster in the workforce system  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| m. Awareness of the cluster in the industry beyond the local region  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |

12. For each of the characteristics below, please rate your cluster consortium’s strength prior to the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | SELECT ONE RESPONSE PER ROW |
|  | **Very Important** | **Somewhat Important** | **Neutral** | **Somewhat Unimportant** | **Very Important** |
| a. Recruit cluster partners  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| b. Retain cluster partners  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| c. Connect cluster partners with each other  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| d. Promote a common purpose and vision among cluster partners  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| e. Interact with staff from federal funding agencies  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| f. Interact with other federal agency staff  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| g. Interact with technical assistance contractor (Coffey Consulting)  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| h. Connect federal staff and cluster partners  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| i. Coordinate provision of technical assistance  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| j. Obtain required matching and/or leveraged funds for this grant  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| k. Identify/Seek additional funding  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| l. Seek tax credits or subsidies  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| m. Develop incentives for collaboration  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| n. Network with other JIAC/AM-JIAC clusters  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |

13. Of the partnerships to the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant in your cluster consortium, approximately what share were present prior to the grant and what share were created for the grant or at other times?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Share of JIAC/AM-JIAC Partnerships |
| a. Present prior to the grant  | | | || | |
| b. Created for the grant  | | | || | |
| c. Created at other times  | | | || | |
|  | 100% |

*If your response to part a of this question was zero, please skip to item 16. Otherwise, please continue to question 14.*

14. On average, have the partnerships that existed prior to the grant gotten stronger, weaker, or stayed about the same over the course of the grant?

MARK ONE ONLY

 1 □ Gotten stronger

 2 □ Gotten weaker

 3 □ Stayed about the same

15. On average, have the new partnerships reached the level of function and strength of the preexisting partnerships?

 1 □ Yes

 0 □ No

16. Please mark whether each of these partners had a role in the strategic planning of grant fund expenditures for JIAC/AM-JIAC, the implementation of grant activities, or both.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | SELECT ONE RESPONSE PER ROW |
|  | **Strategic Planning of Grant Fund Expenditures** | **Implementation of Grant Activities** | **Both** | **Don’t Know** |
| a. Partner A  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ |
| b. Partner B  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ |
| c. Partner C  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ |
| d. Partner D  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ |
| e. Partner E  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ |

17. How likely do you think it is that the cluster consortium partnerships will be sustained beyond the end of the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant?

MARK ONE ONLY

 1 □ Very likely

 2 □ Somewhat likely

 3 □ Neutral

 4 □ Somewhat unlikely

 5 □ Very unlikely

18. How useful to cluster organizations was the Integrated Work Plan (IWP) developed under this grant?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indispensable | Somewhat Useful | Neutral | Not Useful | A Hindrance |
| 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |

9. Did the activities implemented by the cluster consortium differ from those originally planned?

MARK ONE ONLY

 1 □ Yes. All planned activities and some additional activities were implemented.

 2 □ Yes. Some planned activities and some additional activities were implemented.

 3 □ Yes. Only some planned activities implemented.

 4 □ Yes. The implemented activities were substantially different than those planned.

 5 □ Yes. The same kinds of activities were planned and implemented, but the details of them changed.

 0 □ No. The activities that were planned were the same as those implemented.

 98 □ Don’t know what activities were originally planned.

 99 □ Don’t know.

20. What, if any, efforts were made under this grant to promote the inclusion of individuals or groups that are historically underrepresented in your sector, institution, or cluster?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

 1 □ Approached underrepresented organizations about partnering when applying for the grant

 2 □ Assigned leadership roles to cluster partners from underrepresented organizations

 3 □ Advertising in different forms of media than have been used in the past

 4 □ Advertising in the same types of media but with different target audiences (for example, different TV or radio stations, different magazines or newspapers)

 5 □ Inclusion of underrepresented sex in advertising

 6 □ Inclusion of underrepresented races/ethnicities in advertising

 7 □ Inclusion of underrepresented ages in advertising

 8 □ Outreach to schools with underrepresented populations

 9 □ Outreach to community groups with underrepresented populations

10 □ Arranged for an agency to conduct outreach to underrepresented potential partner organizations

11 □ Arranged for an agency to recruit program participants from underrepresented group

98 □ Other *(specify)*

 0 □ No efforts were made to reach underrepresented groups

**E. CLUSTER FUNDING SOURCES**

21. Was the funding your cluster consortium received under the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant sufficient for the grant activities?

 1 □ Yes

 0 □ No

*Please answer question 22 if your response to question 9 was NOT 0. If your answer to question 9 was 0, please skip to question 23.*

22. In the five years prior to the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant, did all or most of the partners involved in this cluster consortium…

MARK ONE ONLY

 1 □ Receive more than one other grant?

 2 □ Receive one other grant?

 3 □ Apply for other grants but not receive any?

 4 □ Did not apply for any grants?

99 □ Don’t know

23. How successful has the cluster consortium been in obtaining matching funds (including both cash and in-kind) for JIAC/AM-JIAC?

MARK ONLY ONE

 1 □ We gathered more than specified in our grant proposal

 2 □ We gathered the amount specified in our grant proposal

 3 □ We gathered less than specified in our grant proposal

 4 □ We did not propose or did not obtain matching funds **SKIP TO 27**

 99 □ Don’t know

24. What kinds of matching funds did the cluster consortium gather for JIAC/AM-JIAC?

MARK ONLY ONE

 1 □ Cash contributions

 2 □ In-kind contributions SKIP TO 26

 3 □ Both cash and in-kind contributions

99 □ Don’t know

25. What was the approximate value of the cash contributions gathered for JIAC/AM-JIAC?

$ | | | | , | | | |.00 CASH CONTRIBUTIONS

99 □ Don’t know

*If your cluster consortium did not gather in-kind contributions (your answer to question 24 was 2), skip to question 27.*

26. What forms did the in-kind contributions take?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

 1 □ Meeting space

 2 □ Laboratory space

 3 □ Furniture, appliances

 4 □ Real estate

 5 □ Utilities

 6 □ Vehicles

 7 □ Clothing or personal work equipment

 8 □ Industry-related equipment

 9 □ Training

10 □ Staffing

11 □ Computers and peripherals

12 □ Software

13 □ Web hosting and/or website development

14 □ Copying and mailing

15 □ Postage

16 □ Use of contact or mailing lists

98 □ Other *(specify)*

99 □ Don’t know

**F. CLUSTER INTERACTIONS WITH FEDERAL AGENCIES**

27. How many Federal Project Officers (FPOs) in total were assigned to all of the partners in your cluster consortium for the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant?

MARK ONE ONLY

 1 □ One

 2 □ Two

**SKIP TO 29**

 3 □ Three

 4 □ Four

 5 □ Five

98 □ Don’t know how many FPOs were assigned

99 □ Don’t know who any FPOs are **SKIP TO 31**

28. From which agency was your cluster consortium’s FPO?

MARK ONE ONLY

 1 □ ETA

**SKIP TO 31**

 2 □ EDA

 3 □ SBA

 4 □ NIST-MEP

 5 □ DOE

29. From which agency was your cluster consortium’s primary FPO?

MARK ONLY ONE

 1 □ ETA

 2 □ EDA

 3 □ SBA

 4 □ NIST-MEP

 5 □ DOE

30. From which other agencies did your cluster consortium have FPOs?

MARK ONLY ONE

 1 □ ETA

 2 □ EDA

 3 □ SBA

 4 □ NIST-MEP

 5 □ DOE

31. Which of the following types of federal support has your cluster consortium accessed as part of the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

 1 □ Clarification of allowable grant activities

 2 □ Clarification of allowable grant expenditures

 3 □ Connection to new partners

 4 □ Advice on accessing matching and/or leveraged funds

 5 □ Advice on other possible funding sources

 6 □ Assistance with marketing, or increasing awareness of, the cluster

 7 □ Facilitating technology transfer

 8 □ Information on developments in the industry

 9 □ Introduction to research and development institutions

10 □ Introduction to educational institutions

11 □ Introductions to certification/licensing/credentialing organizations

12 □ Advice based on experiences of other clusters and/or grantees

13 □ Arranging of networking with other clusters

99 □ Other (*specify*)

 0 □ None **SKIP TO 35**

32. Please grade each type of federal support that your cluster consortium received. Use a scale from A to F, where A is excellent, C is average, and F is very poor.

 (In CATI, the support type column will fill with responses from item 31.)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | SELECT ONE RESPONSE PER ROW |
|  | Possible support providers | This organization did not provide this support | Excellent | Very poor |
|  | A | B | C | D | E |
| Support type 1 | Primary Federal Project Officer | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other FPOs | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other ETA staff | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other federal funding agencies | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Technical Assistance Contractor (Coffey Consulting) | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| Support type 2 | Primary Federal Project Officer | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other FPOs | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other ETA staff | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other federal funding agencies | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Technical Assistance Contractor (Coffey Consulting) | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| Support type 3 | Primary Federal Project Officer | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other FPOs | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other ETA staff | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other federal funding agencies | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Technical Assistance Contractor (Coffey Consulting) | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| Support type 4 | Primary Federal Project Officer | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other FPOs | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other ETA staff | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other federal funding agencies | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Technical Assistance Contractor (Coffey Consulting) | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |

33. Was federal support provided to your cluster consortium in any areas where it was not needed?

 1 □ Yes

 0 □ No **SKIP TO 35**

34. In which areas was unneeded federal support provided?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

 1 □ Clarification of allowable grant activities

 2 □ Clarification of allowable grant expenditures

 3 □ Connection to new partners

 4 □ Advice on accessing matching and/or leveraged funds

 5 □ Advice on other possible funding sources

 6 □ Assistance with marketing, or increasing awareness of, the cluster

 7 □ Facilitating technology transfer

 8 □ Information on developments in the industry

 9 □ Introduction to research and development institutions

10 □ Introduction to educational institutions

11 □ Introductions to certification/licensing/credentialing organizations

12 □ Advice based on experiences of other clusters and/or grantees

13 □ Arranging of networking with other clusters

99 □ Other (*specify*)

 0 □ None

35. Were there any areas in which your cluster consortium needed federal support but did not receive it?

 1 □ Yes

 0 □ No **SKIP TO 37**

36. In which areas did your cluster consortium not receive needed federal support?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

 1 □ Clarification of allowable grant activities

 2 □ Clarification of allowable grant expenditures

 3 □ Connection to new partners

 4 □ Advice on accessing matching and/or leveraged funds

 5 □ Advice on other possible funding sources

 6 □ Assistance with marketing, or increasing awareness of, the cluster

 7 □ Facilitating technology transfer

 8 □ Information on developments in the industry

 9 □ Introduction to research and development institutions

10 □ Introduction to educational institutions

11 □ Introductions to certification/licensing/credentialing organizations

12 □ Advice based on experiences of other clusters and/or grantees

13 □ Arranging of networking with other clusters

99 □ Other (*specify*)

 0 □ None

 *Don’t ask 37-41 if 31 = 0. Don’t ask 37 if 27 = 98.*

37. Overall, how would you rate the ability of the Federal Project Officer (FPO) to provide the support your cluster consortium needed? (If you had multiple FPOs, please rate your primary FPO.)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Average |  | Very Poor | N/A |
| 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ |

38. Overall, how would you rate the ability of other federal participants to provide the support your cluster consortium needed?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Average |  | Very Poor | N/A |
| 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ |

39. How would you rate the timeliness of the federal support and technical assistance your cluster consortium received?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Average |  | Very Poor |
| 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |

40. How would you rate the reliability of the federal support and technical assistance your cluster consortium received?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Average |  | Very Poor |
| 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |

41. How would you rate the adequacy of the federal support and technical assistance your cluster consortium received?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Average |  | Very Poor |
| 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |

42. Did your cluster consortium access technical assistance or other support from nonfederal sources because of issues with the quality or timeliness of federal support?

 1 □ Yes

 0 □ No

**G. CLUSTER DATA USE**

43. What data on the cluster, grant activities, and outcomes does the cluster consortium collect for its own use?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

 1 □ Cluster size and growth

 2 □ Cluster composition, member types

 3 □ Connection to new partners

 4 □ Research and development activities undertaken

 5 □ Interest, uptake, or enrollment in grant activities

 6 □ Length of participation in grant activities

 7 □ Grant activity completion/dropout

 8 □ Impact of grant activities on existing activities

 9 □ Participant demographics

10 □ Credentials/certifications/licenses obtained

11 □ Transfers to four-year schools

12 □ Participants hired

13 □ Participant earnings

14 □ Participant job retention

15 □ Number of businesses counseled

16 □ New firms created

17 □ Sales levels

18 □ Foreign sales levels

19 □ Number of contracts won by businesses

20 □ Value of contracts won by businesses

99 □ Other (*specify*)

 0 □ The cluster does not collect data for its own use.

44. How difficult is it for your cluster consortium to collect the data required for grant reporting?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

 1 □ Very easy

 2 □ Somewhat easy

 3 □ Neutral (or varies a lot across data items)

 4 □ Somewhat difficult

 5 □ Very difficult

45. If your cluster consortium attempts to validate the data it collects, how does it do this?

□ The cluster does not collect data for its own use.

**H. OUTCOMES**

46. Please indicate your perception of the strength and longevity of the impact of the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant on each of the areas below.

|  | SELECT ONE RESPONSE PER ROW | SELECT ONE RESPONSE PER ROW |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strength of Impact | Longevity of Impact |
|  | Very Strong | VeryWeak | Very Strong | Very Weak |
| a. Collaborative environment in the region  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| b. Economic development in the region  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| c. Employment opportunities in the region  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| d. Underrepresented populations and businesses  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |

**I. ENGAGEMENT OF ORGANIZATION WITH PARTNERS**

The next questions are about your organization rather than the cluster.

47. In the table below, please mark the types of organizations your organization is involved in JIAC-related partnerships with, indicating whether the partnerships existed prior to the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant or began due to it?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | SELECT ONE RESPONSE PER ROW |
|  | **Involvement began prior to grant** | **Involvement began due to grant** | **Not involved with this type of organization** |
| a. K–12 educational institutions  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| b. Community colleges  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| c. Four-year colleges or graduate schools  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| d. For-profit educational institutions  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| e. Workforce development agencies  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| f. Economic development agencies  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| g. WIBs  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| h. Chambers of Commerce  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| i. Nonprofit organizations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| j. Trade associations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| k. Utilities  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| l. Military  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| m. Local governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| n. Tribal governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| o. State governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| p. National governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| q. Small businesses  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| r. Disadvantaged businesses  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| s. Other private, for-profit businesses  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| t. Employer groups  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| u. Venture capital organizations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| v. Other *(specify)*   | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |

48. On a scale of 1 to 5, indicate the strength of your organization’s relationship with each of these partners prior to the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant and currently. On this scale, 1 indicates a nonexistent partnership and 5 indicates an extremely close partnership.

|  | SELECT ONE RESPONSE PER ROW | SELECT ONE RESPONSE PER ROW |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strength Prior to Grant | Strength Currently |
|  | **Nonexistent** | **Extremely****Close** | **Nonexistent** | **Extremely****Close** |
| a. K–12 educational institutions  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| b. Community colleges  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| c. Four-year colleges or graduate schools  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| d. For-profit educational institutions  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| e. Workforce development agencies  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| f. Economic development agencies  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| g. WIBs  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| h. Chambers of Commerce  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| i. Nonprofit organizations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| j. Trade associations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| k. Utilities  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| L. Military  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| m. Local governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| n. Tribal governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| o. State governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| p. National governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| q. Small businesses  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| r. Disadvantaged businesses  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| s. Other private, for-profit businesses  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| t. Employer groups  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| u. Venture capital organizations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| v. Other *(specify):* | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

49. How likely do you think it is that your organization’s partnership with each of these entities will be sustained beyond the end of the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant?

 *(In CATI, only those with responses in item 48 will be listed.)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | SELECT ONE RESPONSE PER ROW |
|  | **Very Likely** | **Somewhat Likely** | **Neutral** | **Somewhat Unlikely** | **Very Unlikely** |
| a. K–12 educational institutions  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| b. Community colleges  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| c. Four-year colleges or graduate schools  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| d. For-profit educational institutions  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| e. Workforce development agencies  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| f. Economic development agencies  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| g. WIBs  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| h. Chambers of Commerce  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| i. Other types of Nonprofit organizations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| j. Trade associations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| k. Utilities  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| l. Military  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| m. Local governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| n. Tribal governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| o. State governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| p. National governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| q. Small businesses  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| r. Disadvantaged businesses  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| s. Other private, for-profit businesses  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| t. Employer groups  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| u. Venture capital organizations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| v. Other *(specify)*  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |

50. Please mark whether each of your organization’s partners had a role in the strategic planning of grant fund expenditure for JIAC/AM-JIAC, the implementation of grant activities, or both.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | SELECT ONE RESPONSE PER ROW |
|  | **Strategic Planning of Grant Fund Expenditure** | **Implementation of Grant Activities** | **Both** |
| a. K–12 educational institutions  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| b. Community colleges  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| c. Four-year colleges or graduate schools  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| d. For-profit educational institutions  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| e. Workforce development agencies  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| f. Economic development agencies  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| g. WIBs  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| h. Chambers of Commerce  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| i. Nonprofit organizations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| j. Trade associations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| k. Utilities  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| l. Military  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| m. Local governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| n. Tribal governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| o. State governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| p. National governments  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| q. Small business  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| r. Disadvantaged business  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| s. Other private, for-profit businesses  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| t. Employer groups  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| u. Venture capital organizations  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |
| v. Other *(specify)*  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ |

**J. YOUR ORGANIZATION’S FUNDING SOURCES**

51. In the five years prior to being a part of the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant, did your organization:

MARK one only

 1 □ Operate exclusively on federal grants/resources

 2 □ Receive the majority of funds from federal grants/resources

 3 □ Receive some federal grants/resources

 4 □ Not receive federal grants/resources

 0 □ This organization did not exist prior to the grant

52. Did your organization have a role in the strategic planning of grant fund expenditures for JIAC/AM-JIAC, the implementation of grant activities, or both?

MARK one only

 1 □ Strategic planning of grant fund expenditures

 2 □ Implementation of grant activities

 3 □ Both

 4 □ Neither

53. Was the funding your organization received under the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant sufficient for the grant activities?

 1 □ Yes

 0 □ No

54. How successful has your organization been in obtaining matching funds (including both cash and in-kind) for JIAC/AM-JIAC?

MARK one only

 1 □ We gathered more than specified in our grant proposal

 2 □ We gathered the amount specified in our grant proposal

 3 □ We gathered less than specified in our grant proposal

 4 □ We did not propose or did not obtain matching funds

**SKIP TO 58**

 5 □ We were not the organization responsible for obtaining matching funds

55. What kinds of matching funds did you gather for JIAC/AM-JIAC?

MARK one only

 1 □ Cash contributions

 2 □ In-kind contributions **SKIP TO 57**

 3 □ Both cash and in-kind contributions

56. What was the approximate value of the cash contributions gathered for JIAC/AM-JIAC?

$ | | | | , | | | |.00

 99 □ Don’t know

*If your organization gathered in-kind contributions (your answer to question 55 was 2 or 3), go to question 57.*

*If your organization did not gather in-kind contributions (your answer to question 55 was 1), go to question 58.*

57. What forms did the in-kind contributions take?

mark all that apply

 1 □ Meeting space

 2 □ Laboratory space

 3 □ Furniture, appliances

 4 □ Real estate

 5 □ Utilities

 6 □ Vehicles

 7 □ Clothing or personal work equipment

 8 □ Industry-related equipment

 9 □ Training

10 □ Staffing

11 □ Computers and peripherals

12 □ Software

13 □ Web hosting and/or website development

14 □ Copying and mailing

15 □ Postage

16 □ Use of contact or mailing lists

16 □ Other *(specify)*

16 □ Don’t know

**K. ETA GRANTEE ACTIVITIES**

58. What activities did your organization conduct in the cluster consortium as part of the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant or to support activities funded by the grant?

MARK all that apply

 1 □ Basic skills or job readiness training

 2 □ On-the-job training

 3 □ Incumbent worker training

 4 □ Vocational education

 5 □ Academic education

 6 □ Job placement assistance

 7 □ Mentoring

 8 □ Recruit students/participants

 9 □ Engage other organizations in recruiting students/participants

10 □ Funding/awarding scholarships

11 □ Forge agreements with firms to use program participants as first source of new hires

12 □ Entrepreneurship classes or assistance

13 □ Seminars/ symposiums on applying for SBIRs (Small Business Innovation Research grants or contracts)

14 □ Seminars/ symposiums on applying for STTR (Small Business Technology Transfer Program)

15 □ Instruction on using SAM (System for Award Management)

16 □ Seminars/symposiums on writing proposals

17 □ Curriculum development

18 □ Creation of new certificates

19 □ Transfer of existing certifications/credentials/licenses

20 □ Feasibility studies

21 □ Small business assistance

22 □ Business development

23 □ Export readiness counseling

24 □ Conduct and disseminate market research

25 □ Facilitate collaboration between large and small businesses

26 □ Cluster networking

27 □ Activities to increase awareness of the cluster

99 □ Other *(specify)*

59. What populations were specifically targeted for each of these activities, if any?

 *(In CATI, only those with responses in item 58 will fill.)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | SELECT ONE RESPONSE PER ROW |  |
| **(Only fill rows with responses given in item 58.)** | Incumbent workers | Dislocated workers | Unemployed | Long-term unemployed | Students in particular fields | Students in general | Parents/ guardians | People with disabilities | Veterans | Under-represented demographic groups | HUD Zone location |
| a. Basic skills or job readiness training  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| b. On-the-job training  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| c. Incumbent worker training  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| d. Vocational education  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| e. Academic education  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| f. Job placement assistance  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| g. Mentoring  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| h. Recruit students/participants  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| i. Engage other organizations in recruiting students/participants  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| j. Fund/award scholarships  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| k. Forge agreements with firms to use program participants as first source of new hires  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| l. Entrepreneurship classes or assistance  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| m. Seminars/ symposiums on applying for SBIRs  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| n. Seminars/ symposiums on applying for STTR  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| o. Instruction on using SAM (System for Award Management  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| p. Seminars/symposiums on writing proposals  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| q. Curriculum development  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| r. Creation of new certificates  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| s. Transfer of existing certifications/credentials /licenses  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| t. Feasibility studies  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| u. Small business assistance  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| v. Business development  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| w. Export readiness counseling  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| x. Conduct and disseminate market research  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| y. Facilitate collaboration between large and small businesses  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| z. Cluster networking  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| az. Activities to increase awareness of the cluster  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
| zz. Other (*specify*)  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ | 6 □ | 7 □ | 8 □ | 9 □ | 10 □ | 11 □ |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

60. Did the activities implemented differ from those originally planned?

mark one only

 1 □ Yes. All planned activities and some additional activities were implemented.

 2 □ Yes. Some planned activities and some additional activities were implemented.

 3 □ Yes. Only some planned activities implemented

 4 □ Yes. The implemented activities were substantially different than those planned

 5 □ Yes. The same kinds of activities were planned and implemented, but the details of them changed

 0 □ No. The activities that were planned were the same as those implemented

98 □ Don’t know what was originally planned.

61. What did your organization provide under the ETA portion of the grant to promote entrepreneurship?

mark all that apply

 1 □ Advice on networking

 2 □ Instruction on proposal preparation

 3 □ Instruction on applying for SBIRs (Small Business Innovation Research grants or contracts)

 4 □ Instruction on applying for STTR (Small Business Technology Transfer Program)

 5 □ Instruction on using SAM (System for Award Management)

 6 □ Other specialized seminars or workshops

 7 □ Collaboration opportunities with larger companies

 8 □ Information on other local resources

99 □ Other *(specify)*

 0 □ Nothing

62. What, if any, efforts were made to promote the inclusion of individuals or groups that are historically underrepresented in your sector, institution, or cluster?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

 1 □ Approached underrepresented organizations about partnering when applying for the grant

 2 □ Assigned leadership roles to cluster partners from underrepresented organizations

 3 □ Advertising in different forms of media than have been used in the past

 4 □ Advertising in the same types of media but with different target audiences (e.g., different TV or radio stations, different magazines or newspapers)

 5 □ Inclusion of underrepresented sex in advertising

 6 □ Inclusion of underrepresented races/ethnicities in advertising

 7 □ Inclusion of underrepresented ages in advertising

 8 □ Outreach to schools with underrepresented populations

 9 □ Outreach to community groups with underrepresented populations

10 □ Arranged for an agency to conduct outreach to underrepresented potential partner organizations

11 □ Arranged for an agency to recruit program participants from underrepresented groups

99 □ Other *(specify)*

 0 □ No efforts were made to reach underrepresented groups

63. How useful to your organization was the Integrated Work Plan developed under this grant?

mark one only

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indispensable | Somewhat Useful | Neutral | Not Useful | A Hindrance  |
| 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |

**L. ORGANIZATIONAL INTERACTIONS WITH FEDERAL ASSISTANCE**

64. Please identify any FPOs, other than from ETA, with which your organization interacted.

mark all that apply

 1 □ EDA

 2 □ SBA

 3 □ NIST-MEP

 4 □ DOE

 0 □ None

98 □ Interacted with other FPO(s) but don’t know what kind

99 □ Don’t know who any FPOs are

65. Which of the following types of federal support has your organization accessed as part of the JIAC/AM-JIAC grant?

MARK all that apply

 1 □ Clarification of allowable grant activities

 2 □ Clarification of allowable grant expenditures

 3 □ Connection to new partners

 4 □ Advice on accessing matching and/or leveraged funds

 5 □ Advice on other possible funding sources

 6 □ Assistance with marketing, or increasing awareness of, the cluster

 7 □ Facilitating technology transfer

 8 □ Information on developments in the industry

 9 □ Introduction to research and development institutions

10 □ Introduction to educational institutions

11 □ Introductions to certification/licensing/credentialing organizations

12 □ Advice based on experiences of other clusters and/or grantees

13 □ Arranging of networking with other clusters

99 □ Other *(specify)*

 0 □ None **GO TO 69**

66. Please grade each type of support your organization received. Use a scale from A to F, where A is excellent, C is average, and F is very poor.

 *(In CATI, the support types from item 65 will fill.)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | SELECT ONE RESPONSE PER ROW |
|  | Possible support providers | This organization did not provide this support | Excellent | Very poor |
|  | A | B | C | D | E |
| Support type 1 | ETA Federal Project Officer (FPO) | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other FPOs | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other ETA staff | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other federal funding agencies | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Technical Assistance Contractor (Coffey Consulting) | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| Support type 2 | ETA Federal Project Officer (FPO) | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other FPOs | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other ETA staff | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other federal funding agencies | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Technical Assistance Contractor (Coffey Consulting) | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| Support type 3 | ETA Federal Project Officer (FPO) | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other FPOs | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other ETA staff | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other federal funding agencies | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Technical Assistance Contractor (Coffey Consulting) | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| Support type 4 | ETA Federal Project Officer (FPO) | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other FPOs | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other ETA staff | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Other federal funding agencies | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
|   | Technical Assistance Contractor (Coffey Consulting) | □ | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |

67. Was federal support provided to your organization in any topical areas where it was not needed?

 1 □ Yes

 0 □ No **SKIP TO 69**

68. In which areas was unneeded federal support provided?

mark all that apply

 1 □ Clarification of allowable grant activities

 2 □ Clarification of allowable grant expenditures

 3 □ Connection to new partners

 4 □ Advice on accessing matching and/or leveraged funds

 5 □ Advice on other possible funding sources

 6 □ Assistance with marketing, or increasing awareness of, the cluster

 7 □ Facilitating technology transfer

 8 □ Information on developments in the industry

 9 □ Introduction to research and development institutions

10 □ Introduction to educational institutions

11 □ Introductions to certification/licensing/credentialing organizations

12 □ Advice based on experiences of other clusters and/or grantees

13 □ Arranging of networking with other clusters

99 □ Other *(specify)*

 0 □ None

69. Were there any topical areas in which your organization needed federal support but did not receive it?

 1 □ Yes

 0 □ No **SKIP TO 71**

70. In which areas did your organization not receive needed federal support?

mark all that apply

 1 □ Clarification of allowable grant activities

 2 □ Clarification of allowable grant expenditures

 3 □ Connection to new partners

 4 □ Advice on accessing matching and/or leveraged funds

 5 □ Advice on other possible funding sources

 6 □ Assistance with marketing, or increasing awareness, of the cluster

 7 □ Facilitating technology transfer

 8 □ Information on developments in the industry

 9 □ Introduction to research and development institutions

10 □ Introduction to educational institutions

11 □ Introductions to certification/licensing/credentialing organizations

12 □ Advice based on experiences of other clusters and/or grantees

13 □ Arranging of networking with other clusters

99 □ Other *(specify)*

 0 □ None

 *Don’t answer 71-76 if 65 = 0. Go to 77.*

71. Overall, how would you rate the ability of the ETA Federal Project Officer (FPO) and other ETA staff to provide the support your organization needed?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Average |  | Very Poor |
| A □ | B □ | C □ | D □ | F □ | G □ |

72. Overall, how would you rate the ability of other federal participants to provide the support your organization needed?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Average |  | Very Poor | N/A |
| A □ | B □ | C □ | D □ | F □ | G □ |

73. How would you rate the timeliness of the federal support and technical assistance your organization received?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Average |  | Very Poor |
| A □ | B □ | C □ | D □ | F □ |

74. How would you rate the reliability of the federal support and technical assistance your organization received?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Average |  | Very Poor |
| A □ | B □ | C □ | D □ | F □ |

75. How would you rate the adequacy of the federal support and technical assistance your organization received?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent |  | Average |  | Very Poor |
| A □ | B □ | C □ | D □ | F □ |

76. Did your organization access technical assistance or other support from nonfederal sources because of issues with the quality or timeliness of federal support?

 1 □ Yes

 0 □ No

**M. ORGANIZATIONAL DATA USE**

77. What data on grant activities and outcomes does your organization collect for its own use?

mark all that apply

 1 □ Budgets and expenditures of grant funds

 2 □ Research and development activities undertaken

 3 □ Interest, uptake, or enrollment in grant activities.

 4 □ Length of participation in grant activities

 5 □ Grant activity completion/dropout

 6 □ Impact of grant activities on existing activities

 7 □ Participant demographics.

 8 □ Credentials/certifications/licenses obtained

 9 □ Transfers to four-year schools

10 □ Participants hired

11 □ Participant earnings

12 □ Participant job retention

13 □ Number of businesses counseled

14 □ New firms created

15 □ Sales levels

16 □ Foreign sales levels

17 □ Number of contracts won by businesses

18 □ Value of contracts won by businesses

99 □ Other *(specify)*

 0 □ We do not collect data for our own use

78. How difficult is it for your organization to collect the data required for grant reporting?

**Select one only**

 1 □ Very easy

 2 □ Somewhat easy

 3 □ Neutral (or varies a lot across data items)

 4 □ Somewhat difficult

 5 □ Very difficult

99 □ We are not aware of any data being used for grant reporting.

0 □ We do not collect data for grant reporting.

79. How would you describe ETA’s automated system for data reporting (the HUB system) in each of the following areas?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | SELECT ONE RESPONSE PER ROW |
|  | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Neutral** | **Not so good** | **Very Poor** |
| a. Ease of use  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| b. Usefulness  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |
| c. Efficiency  | 1 □ | 2 □ | 3 □ | 4 □ | 5 □ |

0 □ We do not collect data for grant reporting.

This concludes the survey. Thank you very much for participating.