Appendix C: Primary Data Collection Instruments

Exhibit C-3 **Regional Center Director Interview Protocol**

Notes for reviewers: This interview protocol will be administered to Comprehensive Center (CC) Directors in each of the 19 Regional Centers (RCs). Each interview will take up to 60 minutes and will focus on details of projects the Centers conducted, services provided, capacity developed, and collaborations with other Centers and RELs. Interviewers will ask the questions in an open-ended manner, and note-takers will code responses into pre-specified categories to the extent possible.

- Blue font indicates the mapping to research questions.
- Green font indicates where interview questions are informed by ASPs or survey results.
- Purple font indicates instructions to the interviewer.
- Red font indicates skip patterns / programming notes.
- Blue boxes are instructions or transitions that the interviewer will read to respondents.
- Radio buttons indicate only one answer should be selected.
- Checkboxes indicate the interviewer should check all that apply.

Introduction

Thank you for making time to speak with us today – My name is [*say your NAME*] and I'm joined by my colleague [say note taker's name]. Our organization, [Abt Associates/AnLar], was contracted by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to conduct a study of the Comprehensive Centers. We are very interested in learning more about how the Comprehensive Centers are developing partnerships, building capacity, and providing training and technical support to state and local education agencies, including successes and challenges. The results of this study will be summarized in a report to Congress and are also expected to inform the next Comprehensive Center cycle, beginning in 2024. The call should take no longer than 60 minutes. Before we get started, we would like to know if you have any time constraints. Is your time open after this call, or do you have a hard stop after 60 minutes?

Prior to our call, we reviewed your responses to the pre-interview survey, as well as Annual Service Plans and Annual Evaluation Reports that you shared with the Department of Education. We also reviewed initial analyses of responses to a survey intended to capture technical assistance recipients' experiences working with the Comprehensive Centers. I am following up to gather additional information. During our conversation, I may ask a question that you may have already addressed in other existing documentation. Should this be the case, just let me know. At the end of our conversation, we will review a list of these documents to determine the easiest way for me to access them.

It's important that you know your responses today will be used only for research purposes. None of our study reports will name you as an individual. 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).

With your permission, we would like to record this call to ensure that our notes are as accurate as possible. The recording will only be used for notetaking purposes and will not be shared with anyone outside of the study team. The recording will be destroyed after the interview notes are finalized. Do you consent to being recorded? [if not, don't record the interview].

All answers should be recorded verbatim. To avoid signaling to respondents that they should be doing a particular activity, do not use response categories as follow-up prompts. If respondents answer a question prior to its appearance on the protocol, record their answer when given and skip the question when you come to it on the protocol.

Educational Topics and Services Provided

First, we would first like to discuss the different types of services Comprehensive Centers provide to TA recipients.

We understand that during Year 2 (which overlaps with the 2019-20 school year), your Center had X active projects addressing X topic areas. In this part of the interview, we are interested in finding out how your Center designs these projects.

RO1.2 To what extent do the problems that CCs align with the priorities of SEAs and territories?

	p p
1. How does priorities?	your Center ensure projects are providing the right assistance to meet an SEA's
Probe: do □ SE □ CC □ Th	Stakeholder needs drive the project design, or is it more of an iterative process? A proposes the majority of ideas or drives the design of a project D proposes the majority of ideas or drives the design the design is an equally distributed effort between the CC and SEA ther:
	tent do TA recipients agree that CC support builds sustainable capacity? (sub-question: A recipients have capacity necessary to enact activities and use CC tools on their own s)
recipients, □ TA □ TA □ TA da □ TA	Center takes the lead on a process or activity as opposed to supporting TA what typically is the reason for doing so? A recipients did not have skills or knowledge needed to lead the process or activity a recipient did not have time to lead the process or activity a recipient did not have access to resources needed (such as access to research tabases) A recipients requested CC lead process or activity C is unaware of underlying reason her:
	tent do TA recipients agree that CC support builds sustainable capacity? (sub-question: A recipients have capacity necessary to enact activities and use CC tools on their own s)
Informed by TA red	cipient survey results, Q13, and the pre-interview survey
	portion of projects do you think TA recipients would be capable of conducting enter support?
Proportion	;
_	references part of the Center's logic model. I've pulled it up on the screen so you can talk. I share screen to show logic model and/or list below so they can see the processes.

RQ3.3 To what extent do TA recipients agree that CC support builds sustainable capacity? (sub-question: Extent to which TA recipients have capacity necessary to enact activities and use CC tools on their own to address problems)

0 0 0 0	Conduct a needs assessment Develop a logic model Select evidence-based practices (EBPs) / interventions Plan implementation of EBPs / interventions Support implementation of EBPs / interventions Evaluate results
RQ2.1 What	are the most common services that Comprehensive Centers provide to TA recipients?
Cent clien C C C C C C	Centers' logic model references evidence-based practices. What features of your er's products or resources encourage uptake of evidence-based practices among your ts? Brevity Accessible (such as limiting use of jargon and acronyms) Visually appealing Tailored to audience Freely available Interactive (such as allowing users to sort / filter information) Provides detailed instructions for implementation Other:
_	TA recipient priorities are not addressed by Comprehensive Center projects, and why? TA recipient survey results, <i>Q</i> 3
not a	to TA recipients request assistance in high-priority topic areas that your Center was ble to address? Probe for topic if they do not specify. No (GO TO Q7) Yes
Include drop-	 See the drop-down list to indicate which topic. Sedown options for note-taker to indicate which topic. Topics should include: Accountability & Assessment (Achievement Gaps, Assessment, Data Use, Formative Assessment, Student Outcome Measures) College & Career Readiness (Career & Technical Education, Dropout Prevention, Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit, Graduation, Pre-college Preparation, Work-based Learning) Curriculum & Instruction (Curriculum & Development, Resource Use, Standards Alignment, Literacy, STEM + Computer Science)
	 Diverse Learners (Students of Color (American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic), English Learners, Low Income Students, Students with Disabilities, Students Experiencing Homelessness, Students in Migrant Families, or Students in Foster Care, LGBTQ+ students) Early Learning (Kindergarten Readiness, Head Start) Educational Equity (Inequities in School Funding, Inequities in Access to High-Quality Instruction, Inequities in Access to Support Services, Catch-up Strategies)

ш	Planning, Evaluation & Management (Internal Communication, Compliance
	Monitoring, Family & Community Engagement, Financial Management, Needs
	Assessment, Program Development & Implementation, Program Evaluation, Stakeholder
	Engagement, Strategic Planning)
	Policy & Legislation (Local or State Education Agency Compliance, Every Student
_	Succeeds Act, Policy Development, State Education Agencies, Other Federal Policy)
П	Return to School (Strategies to Support Physical Distancing, Addressing Learning Loss
	during COVID-19, Supporting Students' Emotional Needs during COVID-19,
	Communicating Reopening Policies to Families)
	Schools & Classrooms (Instructional Technology, School Choice, School Climate,
	School Improvement)
	Social-Emotional & Behavioral Learning (Social-Emotional Learning,
	Holistic Student Supports, Wrap-around Services, Growth Mindset)
	Teachers & Leaders (Certification & Licensure, Educator Evaluation, Educator
	Preparation, Leadership, Professional Development for Teachers or Leaders, Recruitment
	& Retention)
	Teaching & Learning (Culturally Responsive Practices, Evidence-Based Practices,
_	Individualized Learning, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, Online/Distance Learning,
	Rural Education, Special Education, Student Engagement)
П	Other, specify
ш	Other, specify
W . 71	
Wl	y have these topics not been addressed? [check all that apply]
Ag	ency Challenges
Ag □	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff
Ag □ □	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes)
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership Meeting diverse needs across TA recipients (and/or regions)
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership Meeting diverse needs across TA recipients (and/or regions)
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership Meeting diverse needs across TA recipients (and/or regions) Cuts in TA recipient staffing and/or budgets
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership Meeting diverse needs across TA recipients (and/or regions) Cuts in TA recipient staffing and/or budgets Difficulty establishing relationships with the TA recipients
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership Meeting diverse needs across TA recipients (and/or regions) Cuts in TA recipient staffing and/or budgets
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership Meeting diverse needs across TA recipients (and/or regions) Cuts in TA recipient staffing and/or budgets Difficulty establishing relationships with the TA recipients Challenges Lack of Center financial resources
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership Meeting diverse needs across TA recipients (and/or regions) Cuts in TA recipient staffing and/or budgets Difficulty establishing relationships with the TA recipients Challenges Lack of Center financial resources Project timeline constraints
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership Meeting diverse needs across TA recipients (and/or regions) Cuts in TA recipient staffing and/or budgets Difficulty establishing relationships with the TA recipients Challenges Lack of Center financial resources Project timeline constraints Lack of communication within the TA recipient agency
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership Meeting diverse needs across TA recipients (and/or regions) Cuts in TA recipient staffing and/or budgets Difficulty establishing relationships with the TA recipients Challenges Lack of Center financial resources Project timeline constraints Lack of communication within the TA recipient agency Mismatch between stated TA recipient needs and Center federal priorities
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership Meeting diverse needs across TA recipients (and/or regions) Cuts in TA recipient staffing and/or budgets Difficulty establishing relationships with the TA recipients Challenges Lack of Center financial resources Project timeline constraints Lack of communication within the TA recipient agency Mismatch between stated TA recipient needs and Center federal priorities Center lacked appropriate skills
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership Meeting diverse needs across TA recipients (and/or regions) Cuts in TA recipient staffing and/or budgets Difficulty establishing relationships with the TA recipients Challenges Lack of Center financial resources Project timeline constraints Lack of communication within the TA recipient agency Mismatch between stated TA recipient needs and Center federal priorities Center lacked appropriate skills Center lacked appropriate content expertise
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership Meeting diverse needs across TA recipients (and/or regions) Cuts in TA recipient staffing and/or budgets Difficulty establishing relationships with the TA recipients Challenges Lack of Center financial resources Project timeline constraints Lack of communication within the TA recipient agency Mismatch between stated TA recipient needs and Center federal priorities Center lacked appropriate skills Center lacked appropriate content expertise Turnover among Center staff
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership Meeting diverse needs across TA recipients (and/or regions) Cuts in TA recipient staffing and/or budgets Difficulty establishing relationships with the TA recipients Challenges Lack of Center financial resources Project timeline constraints Lack of communication within the TA recipient agency Mismatch between stated TA recipient needs and Center federal priorities Center lacked appropriate skills Center lacked appropriate content expertise Turnover among Center staff Center focused on different priorities
Ag	Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership Meeting diverse needs across TA recipients (and/or regions) Cuts in TA recipient staffing and/or budgets Difficulty establishing relationships with the TA recipients Challenges Lack of Center financial resources Project timeline constraints Lack of communication within the TA recipient agency Mismatch between stated TA recipient needs and Center federal priorities Center lacked appropriate skills Center lacked appropriate content expertise Turnover among Center staff Center focused on different priorities Access to data or information
Ag	ency Challenges Turnover among TA recipient staff Changing priorities at TA recipient agency (including COVID-related changes) State policy shifts Turnover in chief state school officer and/or other leadership Meeting diverse needs across TA recipients (and/or regions) Cuts in TA recipient staffing and/or budgets Difficulty establishing relationships with the TA recipients Challenges Lack of Center financial resources Project timeline constraints Lack of communication within the TA recipient agency Mismatch between stated TA recipient needs and Center federal priorities Center lacked appropriate skills Center lacked appropriate content expertise Turnover among Center staff Center focused on different priorities

a)

Dimensions of Capacity

The next set of questions is about the Comprehensive Centers' efforts to increase TA recipients' capacity to identify, implement, and sustain effective evidence-based practices.

RQ3.1 What dimensions of capacity (human, organizational, resource, policy) are CC projects designed to increase?

/.		w does your Center determine which capacities (numan, organizational, resource, policy)
		recipients need to develop?
		The CC needs assessment helps identify needed capacities
		TA recipients request support in building specific capacities
		The capacities to be developed depend on the project topic
	ш	The capacities to be developed depend on the phase of implementation involved (needs
		assessment, logic model, select EBPs, etc.)
RQ3.3	То у	what extent do TA recipients agree that CC support builds sustainable capacity?
8.	Wł	nat are the key challenges in developing TA recipients' capacity?
		Staff buy in
		Leadership buy-in
		Stability in TA recipient staff (staff retention)
		Preexisting skills
		Preexisting content expertise
		Communication among different departments (silos)
		Leadership invested in using evidence
		Other:
RQ3.2	Тол	what extent do TA recipients report that Comprehensive Centers improve their capacity and in
what di	mer	nsions? Informed by TA recipient survey results, Q14
9.		w can you tell whether a TA recipient has developed capacity?
		TA recipients take more ownership for services previously provided by CC
		TA recipients train others in their agency
		TA recipients use CC-provided resources and tools independently
		TA recipients are able to adapt resources and tools to apply to new projects
		TA recipients indicate they no longer need CC assistance
		Other:
RQ3.2	То у	what extent do TA recipients report that Comprehensive Centers improve their capacity and in
what di	mer	asions?
10.	Wł	nat are the most effective methods the Center has used to build capacity?
		Consultation
		Meeting facilitation
		Brokering stakeholder connections
		Webinars or expert panels
		Provide products or tools
		Data analysis
		Provide lit review / references
	_	110.12d In 10.10 W / Telefended

Changes due to COVID-19

We would now like to turn your attention to how Center work shifted in response to COVID-19.

RQ1.4 To what extent did Comprehensive Centers shift the focus of their work in response to COVID-19? What are the most common COVID-19-related issues that Comprehensive Centers addressed? Informed by TA recipient survey results, Q20 & 21

11. Were new projects, products, or tools initiated to address COVID-related needs?

	I No (GO TO Q12) I Yes	
L	1 Yes	
a	area mentioned, probe for targeted groups: Students of Colc Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic), LGBTQ+ Students, Englis Students, Students with Disabilities, Students Experiencing Migrant Families, or Students in Foster Care]	or (American Indian/Alaskan h Learners, Low Income
	Focus of new work	Targeted group(s)
	ssing achievement gaps	
learni	ology access for students, including strategies to support remote ng for students with limited Internet access	
	ing strategies for remote instruction	
	gies to support continuity of learning	
	orting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs	
distar	to reopen schools, including strategies to support physical cing and other health or safety-related procedures	
	ging students and families	
	gies for developing attendance policies	
	gies for developing graduation and grading policies	
	nce for meal delivery services	
☐ Other		
any I made	nat ways was your Center able to be responsive to rapidly coarriers or challenges to being responsive? [probe for whether it difficult to be responsive] Able to transition to virtual meetings Maintained open lines of communication with TA recipients Maintained open lines of communication with CC program at UD Other: ers/Challenges ustaining stakeholder engagement during a crisis Meed to address new topics or high-leverage problems ack of guidance regarding when and to what extent approved pother:	er Center program structure S.S. Department of Education

Collaboration Successes and Challenges

Next, we would like to discuss the experiences your Center has had collaborating with the Comprehensive Center program and with external partners, including the Regional Educational Laboratories.

RQ4.2 To what extent, and in what ways, do Regional Comprehensive Centers collaborate with each other and with the National Comprehensive Center? *Informed by ASPs field 107 (CC partner)*

13. What types of collaboration, if any, does your Center engage in with the National Center?

 □ Use NC products / tools or attend I □ Jointly facilitate meetings □ Jointly produce services and/or product □ Other: □ Does not engage with NC 		h as needs assessments or logic models
RQ4.1 What are the perceived benefits and character program? 14. What are the three most valuable ser Center, and why? Categories obtaine Services/supports listed below are potential re	rvices or su d from NC A	Annual Evaluation Report
nterviewee]	sponse optic	ions for couning purposes, do not read fist to
Services/Supports	Most Valuable	Why
Toolkits or tools (such as Returning to School: A Toolkit for Principals; survey instruments)		☐ Can be given directly to practitioners ☐ Help transition from ideas to action ☐ Can be disseminated widely and help with statewide efforts
Publications or other resources (such as policy briefs, Native Education Resources Collection)		 □ Relevant to project(s) □ Evidence-based □ Timely □ Can be disseminated widely and help with statewide efforts
Topic work groups (includes financial transparency, Native American collaborative, evaluation, COVID response)		 Help Center understand what other states are doing Help identify innovations Help identify possibilities for cross-state collaboration
Expert roundtables/webinars/events open to broader audience		☐ Relevant to project(s) ☐ Evidence-based ☐ Timely
Other		☐ Relevant to project(s) ☐ Evidence-based ☐ Timely
15. What challenges, if any, have you ex □ Too many meetings □ Duplication of effort □ Logistics / scheduling difficult	-	in working with the National Center?

			Lack of clarity regarding roles and responsibilities Lack of coordination Not sufficiently responsive to timelines None Other:
other a	nd w	ith t	extent, and in what ways, do Regional Comprehensive Centers collaborate with each the National Comprehensive Center? <i>Informed by ASPs field 107 (CC partner) Skip if the RC partnerships</i>
16.	Wh	at a	re the benefits and challenges in collaborating with other Regional Centers?
	Bei	nefit	es:
		Op Acc Op Op No	portunities for collaborative implementation processes (such as common trainings) portunities to share materials that speed up implementation cess to existing tools addressing a common priority area portunities to leverage content expertise portunities to leverage skills ne ner:
			nges
			neduling/logistics llaborative projects are less tailored to local needs
			ck of clarity in roles/responsibilities
		No	•
		Oth	ner:
RQ4.1 Center			e the perceived benefits and challenges of changes to the structure of the Comprehensive ?
17.	to 2	2019 No	rou involved in the previous round of Comprehensive Centers, which ran from 2012 of (GO TO Q20)
	b)	In	what capacity were you involved in the previous round?
			CC Director at the same Center
		Ц	CC Director at a different Center ☐ If different Center, which one?
			CC staff at same Center
			CC staff at different Center
			Other:
18.	Na	tion	19 cycle revised the Centers program in several ways. In addition to adding the al Center, the number of RCs increased from 15 to 19. Has this been beneficial or d why? □ Beneficial □ Not beneficial

_ _ _ _	More tailored to local needs More resources for regional support Improved coordination and information sharin None Other:	ng
_ _ _ _	Fewer resources for regional support Less information sharing/coordination Divided regions in ways that undermined con None Other:	tinuity of efforts
	e 2019 cycle, the Content Centers were eliminicated with this change?	nated. What benefits and challenges
	nefits Centralization of expertise within one NC instances Increased efficiency Enhanced ability to build capacity None Other:	tead of multiple Content Centers
	Reduced access to in-depth content expertise Duplication of effort across CCs Lack of clarity regarding roles and responsibi Lack of coordination Less timely access to content expertise None Other:	lities
	ent, and in what ways, do Comprehensive Cent nsive Center and REL activities overlap with e	
presentation □ Co-dev □ Co-dev □ Joint se	Center collaborated with RELs beyond the jons, co-develop resources or tools, or provide velop presentations (such as webinars, expert pavelop resources or tools ervice delivery	e joint service delivery?
	ent, and in what ways, do Comprehensive Cent nsive Center and REL activities overlap with e	
	some types of Center services that would ben ne REL and your Center? O TO Q22)	nefit from more collaboration

	Ye	5
a)		Conduct a needs assessment Develop a logic model Select evidence-based practices (EBPs), interventions, or state-wide efforts Plan implementation of EBPs, interventions, or state-wide efforts Support implementation of EBPs, interventions, or state-wide efforts Evaluate results Other:
		extent, and in what ways, do Comprehensive Centers collaborate with the RELs? In what rehensive Center and REL activities overlap with each other, if at all?
_ _ _ _	RE Ov Wo Ins Mi	challenges do you experience in collaborating with RELs? L is part of a competitor organization erlap / duplication of services ork with different stakeholders or offices ufficient resources / time to collaborate salignment of priorities er:
RQ4.3 To	what	extent, and in what ways, do Comprehensive Centers collaborate with the RELs? In what rehensive Center and REL activities overlap with each other, if at all? <i>ASP field 112 Other</i>
	cle?	f at all, has collaboration between your Center and the RELs changed since the last In what ways has it changed? Stayed the same Increased O More co-planning of projects O More jointly provided services O More co-create tools or events O More co-facilitating of events Decreased O Less co-planning of projects O Less jointly provide services O Less co-creating tools or events O Less co-facilitating of events O Less co-facilitating of events
		extent, and in what ways, do Comprehensive Centers collaborate with the RELs? In what rehensive Center and REL activities overlap with each other, if at all?
in or □	their resu Red Inc Oth	e joint needs sensing between the Centers and the Regional Educational Laboratories region that was introduced in the 2019 cycle helped you avoid duplication of effort lited in increased collaboration? duced duplication of effort reased collaboration her:

RQ4.4 To what extent do Comprehensive Centers refer TA recipients to other ED-funded TA Centers? 25. Did you refer any TA recipients to other ED-funded TA Centers? [Equity Assistance Center/Other1 □ No (GO TO Q26) □ Yes Tell us about the reasons for this referral. ☐ To avoid duplication of effort □ Other TA Center had more hours/staff available to meet needs □ Other TA Center had content area or methodological expertise needed to meet needs ☐ TA recipient requested support outside the scope / strategic goals of the Center ☐ TA recipient requested support with minimal return on investment RQ4.1 What are the perceived benefits and challenges of changes to the structure of the Comprehensive Center program?

26. Reflecting across your projects, what is the biggest remaining challenge in working with partners—including the National Centers, the RELs, other Regional Centers, or the partners we just discussed—to assist TA recipients?

Identifying the right partners for content knowledge
Identifying the right partners for technical / methodological expertise
Coordinating staff time / availability
Coordinating responsibilities for different parts of the project
Establishing and adhering to deadlines
Adjusting to changing demands
Other:

Closing Statement

Thank you so much for providing all this information. We really enjoyed learning more about your Comprehensive Center and appreciate your time!

If any documents were mentioned that we need to gather: Earlier you mentioned [documents], which would be helpful for me to have to better understand your Center. What would be the easiest way for me to access these documents?