Original OMB-approved question

Section of the Survey: SYSTEM LEAD ENTITY QUESTIONNAIRE– SECTORAL PARTNERSHIP
Main Question: FIPS Code of Area Served   *If not included optional question to provide counties served or Native American reservation/trust land/area names.
                                   Response Option(s): N/A
Section of the Survey: Training Provider Questionnaire
Main Question/Topic: Wraparound Services
Question: What wraparound services/non-technical services do you directly provide?
Response Option(s): Dropdown
Transportation
Childcare
Health Services
Legal Services
Counseling
Education Services
Clothing
Laptops
Wi-Fi
Other learning equipment
Work Supplies
Financial and budgeting resources
Other_____

Section of the Survey: Training Provider Questionnaire
Main Question/Topic: Wraparound Services
Question: What wraparound services/non-technical services did you partner or fund with other organizations?
Response Option(s): Dropdown
Transportation
Childcare
Health Services
Legal Services
Counseling
Education Services
Clothing
Laptops
Wi-Fi
Other learning equipment
Work Supplies
Financial and budgeting resources
Other_____

Proposed change

Section of the Survey: SYSTEM LEAD ENTITY QUESTIONNAIRE– SECTORAL PARTNERSHIP
Main Question: List all county-level FIPS codes of expected areas served
Option(s):
expected area served has changed from the last time you reported [If respondent selects this option they will provide an answ
• The expected area served has **not** changed from the last time you reported   [If respondent selects this option they will skip

Section of the Survey: SYSTEM LEAD ENTITY QUESTIONNAIRE– SECTORAL PARTNERSHIP
Main Question/Topic: Wraparound Services
Question: What wraparound services were provided to GJC participants in the last six months?
Select all that apply
Response Option(s): *Radio list*
Select all that apply
• Transportation
• Childcare
• Career Services and learning materials
• Mental health services
• Life skills
• Navigation
• Other – please specify (text field, 25-character limit)

Change made

- Added instructional language to help grantees better answer the question and added skip logic to reduce burden.

- Streamlined the two questions into one question
- Streamlined and reduced the options from 13 categories to 7 by aggregating the original listed options into larger categories • Moved the question into a different section of the survey so it will be asked bi-annually instead of every quarter

Justification

Claryifing langauge will improve data quality and reduce redundancy. Respondents will see their last reported FIPS codes and either confirm their service area or if their service area has changed, they will update their FIPS codes. Previously, all respondents had to report FIPS codes each six months which resulted in lower quality data and high burden.

In the OMB-approved survey, questions regarding wraparound services are asked in the Training Provider section of the survey. For each training provider and program listed, grantees list the wraparound services offered to participants for that program. However, training providers are not always the providers of wraparound services, which may be offered through a different sub-awardee or partner. Additionally, the wraparound service provider may offer the same services to several training providers. Therefore, to capture more accurate information from the partners who provide wraparound services, we recommend moving this question to the sectoral partnership.

The next recommendation is to revise the wraparound service categories. The proposed change includes better defined and tailored categories.

Finally, in the original OMB-approved survey, there is one question about wraparound services directly provided and another question on wraparound services provided through partners or funded by other organizations. This question separates out who is offering the services, however, in implementation, wraparound services providers may be other organizations but are funded with GJC funds. The current break out of this question does not accurately capture how wraparound services are implemented.

Type