Evaluation of the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers

OMB Clearance Request for Data Collection Instruments

Part A: Supporting Statement for Paperwork Reduction Act Submission

(Revision of the Currently Approved Collection 1850-0914)

October 2016

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

Prepared by:
IMPAQ International

INTRODUCTION

This document is a revision of the currently approved collection for the National Evaluation of the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers. This five-year evaluation has been underway since September of 2013. The original request was submitted in December of 2013 and approved in March of 2014 (OMB Control Number 1850-0914). It included six data collection instruments: 1) Design-Focused Interview Guide for Center Staff; 2) Implementation-Focused Interview Guide for Center Staff; 3) Implementation-Focused Interview Guide for Technical Assistance (TA) Recipients; 4) Center Staff Survey; 5) TA Recipient Survey; and 6) TA Event Observation Guide. Of these six approved instruments, instruments 1-3 have been completed and the related burden hours are deleted in this revision. Instruments 4-6 are still being used to collect data. In the originally approved submission, it was noted that the Outcomes-Focused Interview Protocols would be developed and added later. The current request is for the addition of two new data collection instruments: 1) Outcomes-Focused Interview Guide for Center Staff; and 2) Outcomes-Focused Interview Guide for TA Recipients. The current submission includes the original statement, along with the description of the two new protocols and an updated total response burden estimate. We are requesting review of the new protocols and the revised burden estimate.

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 the 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.

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 Program, a discretionary grant program establishing technical assistance centers. The Comprehensive Centers 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 Comprehensive Centers Program. The Regional Centers each serve one to seven U.S. states, territories, and possessions. They provide technical assistance that

---

[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

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;
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 Comprehensive Centers intend to build SEA capacity (referred to as *theories of action*) and what types of activities they actually conduct to build capacity.

Evaluation Questions

The evaluation will address research questions in three areas:

Design:
1. How did the Centers define capacity building?

2. What theories of action did the Centers use to guide their general capacity-building work?
3. How did the Centers assess the needs of their constituencies?

Implementation:
4. What strategies did Centers employ to achieve their outcomes?
5. To what extent did Centers implement technical assistance to their constituents as planned?
6. To what extent and how did Centers collaborate with each other, by, for example, sharing or building on other Centers' resources and expertise?

Outcomes:
7. To what extent did Centers achieve their goals and objectives, especially capacity-building outcomes?

Focus on Two Federal Priority Areas

To gather data more in-depth information, 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 the last few years. This evaluation is well poised to examine the role that the Centers play in supporting state efforts in this priority area.

Given the overarching nature of the effective teachers and leaders area, and the recent policy focus on early learning efforts, we believe that focusing on these two priority areas will give us a good picture about how Centers generally develop SEA capacity (and in the case of Content Centers, both SEA and Regional Center capacity) and what difference the Centers' efforts may have made. Further, we believe that SEAs' capacity-building needs and the Centers' approach

to providing TA in these two priority areas 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 effective teachers and leaders may be different than the needs and approach to building capacity related to early learning initiatives). Thus, by focusing on these two priority areas, we will gain detailed information on the Centers' capacity-building activities, while still being able to learn about the variety of needs, approaches, and 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 about capacity-building activities and outcomes in sufficient detail.

Data Sources

Data collection for this study consists of interviews of Center staff and TA recipients, surveys of Center staff and TA recipients, and observations of TA events. The study instruments include three previously approved instruments for which all data collection has been completed; three data collection instruments that will be in use for continuing data collection in 2017; and two new instruments:

Already approved in the original OMB submission and all data collection completed:

- Design-Focused Interview Guide for Center Staff
- Implementation-Focused Interview Guide for Center Staff
- Implementation-Focused Interview Guide for TA Recipients

Already approved in the original OMB submission and data collection continuing:

- Center Staff Survey
- TA Recipient Survey
- TA Event Observation Guide

New data collection instruments to be reviewed in this submission:

- Outcomes-Focused Interview Guide for Center Staff
    - Purpose: To obtain the Center staff's perspectives on outcomes of the Centers' projects in the two key priority areas.
    - Sample: The sample includes all 22 Centers, and an estimated 114 interview participants. We estimate that 16 Centers will have projects in both teacher/leader effectiveness and early learning. We will conduct two group interviews at those Centers; one interview focused on each priority area. We estimate that 6 Centers will have projects in teacher/leader effectiveness, but

not early learning. We will conduct one group interview at those Centers. This totals to an estimate of 38 group interviews. We estimate an average of 3 participants per group interview, for a total of 114 participants. Each group interview will include staff working in this priority area, including staff who work on one focal project to be discussed in the interview. The focal project will be among those that were discussed in 2016 implementation-focused interviews. The outcomes-focused interviews will follow up on outcomes of these same projects. Center directors will be asked to identify appropriate staff to participate in these interviews. Groups may include TA managers, content specialists, and Center directors.
- o Timing: April-May 2017

- Outcomes-Focused Interview Guide for TA Recipients
  - o Purpose: To obtain the TA recipients' perspectives on outcomes of the Centers' projects in the two key priority areas.
  - o Sample: The TA recipient sample includes 38 participants. Participants represent recipients of Center TA (usually staff of state education agencies) who work on the projects discussed in Center interviews in each of the two priority areas. Thus, based on the estimate above of 38 group interviews that focus on one project each, we estimate a total interview sample of 38 participants (22 recipients of teacher effectiveness projects and 16 recipients of early learning projects). We will ask each Center to identify one individual who is a key recipient of services provided through the focal project discussed in each of the outcomes-focused interviews with Center staff.
  - o Timing: Within two months of Center site visits, approximately May-August, 2017

Evaluation Reports

The evaluation will produce two reports. The first report will be an interim report focusing on how the Comprehensive Centers designed their work as technical assistance providers. The report will describe the Centers' 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 2017.

A final report will be produced in late 2018. The final report will integrate all study findings.

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 revision to an approved 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 Comprehensive Center Program with two reports. The first report, to be produced in early 2017, will focus on the design of the Centers' work. The final summative report will synthesize all findings and will be produced in late 2018. The reports will inform the Department of Education, the Comprehensive Center program, and the larger field about the design, implementation, and outcomes of the Centers' 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 Center staff surveys will be administered online using an automated survey administration and data collection system. Online surveys generally take less

---

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

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 Comprehensive Centers. The evaluation will also make use of data and documents already collected, produced, or maintained by the Centers. 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 Center is operated by a small business entity, and several Centers have small business partners. The evaluation team will minimize burden on these entities by limiting the length of the interviews, scheduling interviews at the convenience of staff, and using existing data whenever possible.

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 the Centers are using and the outcomes of the Centers' work. Understanding the strategies that the Centers implement and the outcomes they achieve will enable federal policy makers and program managers to monitor the program and provide useful guidance to future Centers.

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 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 in Volume 81, October 31, 2016, page 75388. To date, no public comments have been received. The 30 day FR notice will be prepared and published as required.

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 is made to ensure that the responses of the TA recipients and Center 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 are 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 is 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 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.

---

[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)

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.

The burden table below, in Exhibit 1, presents the revised burden estimate for this study; and the revised estimate of costs for this burden are presented in Exhibit 2. The originally approved burden estimate for this study included the following instruments for which all data collection has now been completed:

- Design-Focused Interview Guide for Center Staff
- Implementation-Focused Interview Guide for Center Staff
- Implementation-Focused Interview Guide for TA Recipients

These instruments have been removed from the revised burden table (Exhibit 1). The revised table includes the two new instruments, and the three already approved, continuing instruments:

- Outcomes-Focused Interview Guide for Center Staff
- Outcomes-Focused Interview Guide for TA Recipients
- Center Staff Survey
- TA Recipient Survey
- TA Event Observation Guide

The original OMB-approved burden estimate for this study was for 764 annual responses and 332 annual burden hours, for each of three years of data collection. The revised estimate of responses in Exhibit 1 is for 649 annual responses, or a reduction of 115 responses annually. The revised hours burden in Exhibit 1 is for 236 annual burden hours, for a reduction of 96 annual burden hours.

The originally approved total estimated monetary cost of the burden was $44,075 and the annualized cost was $14,688. The revised total estimate, as shown in Exhibit 2, is $31,815, and the revised annualized cost estimate is $10,605. This represents a reduction in the total monetary cost burden of $12,260 and a reduction in the annualized cost burden of $4,083, with an annualized cost reduction for Center staff of $1,395 and for TA recipients of $2,688.

Estimated response rates for the new instruments are based on averages of response rates achieved so far for Center and TA recipient interviews. We achieved a 100 percent response rate for the Center staff interviews and an average 85 percent response rate for the TA recipient interviews.

The Center staff survey requires approximately 20 minutes to complete, including the time for reading our introductory letter and directions. The TA recipient survey requires about 15 minutes to complete. We estimate that TA observations will require 10 minutes of Center staff time to coordinate with evaluators. For the new Outcomes-Focused Interview Guides that will be administered in 2017, we estimate 90 minutes for administration of the Center staff interview and 60 minutes for the TA recipient interview. Estimates are based on past experience and on pretests of each new protocol with one Center staff and one TA recipient.

Center 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 other state agency that addresses educational issues.

Exhibit 1. Estimate of Revised Response Burden by Instrument

Data Collection Activity	Sample Size	Response Rate	Total Respondents	Time (hours)	Number of Administra-tions	Number of Responses	Total Hour Burden	Hourly Rate	Estimated Monetary Cost of Burden
Outcomes-Focused Interview Guide for Center Staff	114	100%	114	1.5	1	114	171	$45	$7,695
Outcomes-Focused Interview Guide for TA Recipients	38	85%	32	1	1	32	32	$45	$1,440
Center Staff Survey	264	90%	238	0.33	3	714	235	$45	$10,575
TA Recipient Survey	440	80%	352	0.25	3	1056	264	$45	$11,880
TA Event Observation Guide	10	100%	10	0.17	3	30	5	$45	$225
Totals	866		746			1946	707		$31,815
Annual Totals						649	236		$10,605

Notes:
Shaded rows indicate continuing activities that were previously approved.

Estimated sample size of 114 for the Outcomes-Focused Interview Guide for Center Staff assumes 3 teacher/leader effectiveness staff participating from all 22 Centers and 3 early learning staff participating from 16 Centers.

Estimated sample size for the Outcomes-Focused Interview Guide for TA Recipients assumes 1 teacher/leader effectiveness TA recipient per 22 Centers and 1 early learning TA recipient per 16 Centers.

Exhibit 2. Revised Estimate of Annualized Costs by Respondent Type (Per Year for 3 Years)

Respondent Type	Total Cost	Annualized Cost
Center Staff	$18,495	$6,165
TA Recipient	$13,320	$4,440
Total	$31,815	$10,605

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. There are no record keepers.

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. The 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 revision to previously approved submission; we are requesting review of two new interview protocols. The original, approved submission noted that the outcomes-focused interview protocols would be developed later and were not included in the original package. The revised burden estimate and cost estimate is provided in Exhibits 1 and 2. Three of the originally approved instruments have been completed and the associated burden has been removed from this submission. As a result, there is an overall reduction in responses and burden, even though two new protocols have been added to the collection.

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 began in April of 2015 and will conclude in 2017. No complex analytical techniques will be used. Methods of analysis will include calculation of frequencies, descriptive statistics, and content analysis of qualitative data.

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							■				■				■					
Center design-focused interviews																				
Conduct on-site group interviews of CC staff							■													
Center implementation-focused interviews																				
Conduct on-site group interviews of CC staff							■				■									
TA recipient implementation -focused interviews																				
Conduct telephone interviews with TA recipients							■	■			■	■								
Center outcomes-focused interviews																				
Conduct on-site group interviews of CC staff															■					
TA recipient outcomes-focused interviews																				
Conduct telephone interviews with TA recipients															■	■				
TA Event Observations																				
Conduct observations of profiled projects														■	■	■				
Interim report																				
Report on Center designs/ theories of action														■						
Final report																				
Final report summarizing all findings																				■

15

16.2   Publication

The evaluation will produce two reports (see Exhibit 3 for timeline). The first report will be an interim report focusing on the program design questions – how the Centers designed their work as technical assistance providers. The report will describe the Centers' underlying theories of action and definitions of capacity building, and explain how the Centers assessed their constituents' needs and developed work plans to address those needs. This report will be available in early 2017.

A final summative report, synthesizing all findings but with greatest focus on the implementation and outcomes of the Centers' technical assistance in two priority areas, will be produced in late 2018. The report will include descriptions of the strategies used to build SEA capacity, common challenges faced and ways the Centers sought to address them, the extent to which Centers achieved their goals and objectives, factors that may have contributed to success (or failure) in achieving expected outcomes, and the extent to which Centers' outcomes aligned with and supported their theories of action. This report will also include 6-10 profiles of multi-year projects, which will be selected and documented to provide detailed examples of Centers' capacity building process and outcomes.

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.