

# **Appendix A**

## **TIIAP Case Study Methodology and Sites**



# Appendix A

## TIIAP Case Study Methodology and Sites

---

Westat staff conducted site visits and wrote case study reports for 25 TIIAP projects in order to examine the context, strategies, organization, accomplishments, and factors leading to their success. Site visits were used to obtain detailed information on the planning and implementation processes used by the various projects. The case studies were also employed in identifying lessons learned and those which are most applicable to certain types of projects. Findings were used to characterize common themes and promising practices that can be applied elsewhere.

### SITE SELECTION

The site selection process was based on a total number of 206 projects for 1994 and 1995, which excludes 4 projects from 1994 that received additional monies in 1995. Other projects were also excluded from the selection pool. Characteristics of excluded projects were:

- Projects that have been suspended, withdrawn, or terminated;
- Projects that lasted fewer than 12 months; and
- Projects that received awards of less than \$75,000.

The criteria used in the site selection process included the year, geographic region, category, size of the award, area served, and domain. Projects from both award years, 1994 and 1995, were included in the list of case study sites. Fifteen of the 25 sites were selected from the 1994 cohort because a greater percentage of these projects have been completed, and therefore staff should be able to provide more perspective on

what was achieved through the project, as well as the sustainability of project activities.

Other areas were also important to the selection process. Geographic region was used to cover the entire country using the four regions designated by the Bureau of Economic Analysis, which correspond to the categories in the TIIAP database. Case studies were evenly distributed across the Northeast, Southeast, Central, and West regions. Category, or type of award, was also factored into the selection process. The proportion of case study sites by project type was similar to the distribution across all 1994 and 1995 projects:

Project type	All projects (n=206)	Case studies (n=25)
Access .....	22.3%	16.0%
Demonstration .....	50.5%	52.0%
Planning .....	27.2%	32.0%

The last three criteria used for site selection included size of award, area served, and domain. Projects of less than \$75,000 were excluded, with the remaining sites divided into three categories: \$75,000 - \$199,999; \$200,000 - \$399,999; and \$400,000 and above. Some TIIAP projects involve an entire state; others focus on an urban community. Other target areas include rural communities, a region within one state, a region involving more than one state, and the nation as a whole. The five domain categories used for the FY 1997 awards (community-wide networking; education, culture, and lifelong learning; health; public and community services; and public safety) were used in site selection.

Application area	All projects (n=206)	Case studies (n=25)
Community		
Networking .....	25.7%	32.0%
ELCC .....	34.5%	28.0%
Health.....	12.1%	12.0%
Public Services.....	24.8%	20.0%
Public Safety.....	2.9%	8.0%

With the exception of the year of the project, the number of sites selected from each application area was proportional to the total number of projects. In addition, sites were randomly selected within the application area.

One site from the original sample was removed and replaced with another comparable site. In attempting to contact the project director from a planning project at the University of New Mexico, Gallup Branch, Westat staff learned that the project director was hired specifically for and with TIIAP funds and, thus, left the project with no forwarding information when funding ended. The project director did most of the work on the grant and would be critical to interview for the case study. Current staff at the University of New Mexico who finished the final project report were willing to host the site visit, but they were not involved during the grant period and were only involved minimally at the end to close out the grant. They indicated that the Consortium established by the planning grant was still active, but none of the original members were available.

With TIIAP approval, another site was selected that closely matched the original selection characteristics (western, ELCC, planning, 1994, fund amount) for the New Mexico project. The Western Brokering Project in Boulder, CO, was ultimately selected.

## CASE STUDY METHODOLOGY

Twelve Westat staff members were trained for the site visits, including background on the TIIAP program and mission, overview of the study purpose, use of interview protocols, and plans for writing case study reports. Westat prepared and pilot tested an unstructured discussion guide for conducting intensive interviews. Prior to the site visits, team members reviewed the project's quarterly and final reports submitted to TIIAP to provide some background information, identify important questions to ask, and tailor the discussion guide accordingly.

Site visits were usually conducted over a 2-day period by two Westat staff members. During the visits, Westat team members attempted to interview the original project personnel. In some cases, however, this was not possible, and their successors were contacted. Site visitors observed project activities where useful to do so. Documents from the sites were also collected when available and often complemented the quarterly and final reports already submitted.

Following each visit, case study reports were written according to an outline for consistency. Each report included:

- Purpose and general approach of the project;
- Description of grant recipient and partners;
- Community and telecommunications context;
- Implementation activities occurring before, during, and after the grant period;
- Issues and problems in implementation;
- Accomplishments and impacts;
- Evaluation and dissemination activities;
- Lessons learned;
- Future plans; and
- Site visit methodology.

<b>CASE STUDY SITES</b>				
<b>Project</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Domain</b>
Charlotte's Web	Charlotte, NC	1994	Demonstration	Community Networking
Comanche County Memorial Hospital	Lawton, OK	1994	Demonstration	Health
Cornell University Family Life and Development Center	Ithaca, NY	1994	Planning	Public Safety
Distance Learning and Literacy Networks in Louisiana	New Orleans, LA	1994	Demonstration	ECLL
Grace Hill Neighborhood Services	St. Louis, MO	1994	Demonstration	Public Services
Greater Kalamazoo TeleCity USA	Kalamazoo, MI	1995	Demonstration	Community Networking
Info/Pennsylvania Kiosk Project	Harrisburg, PA	1994	Demonstration	Public Services
Leadership, Education, and Athletics in Partnership	New Haven, CT	1994	Demonstration	ECLL
Los Angeles Free-Net	Los Angeles, CA	1994	Demonstration	Community Networking
Mni Sose Intertribal Water Rights Coalition, Inc.	Rapid City, SD	1995	Planning	Community Networking
Mobile Community Health Information Network	Mobile, AL	1995	Access	Health
National Emergency Resource Information Network	Seattle, WA	1995	Planning	Public Safety
NetWellness	Cincinnati, OH	1994	Demonstration	Health
New York State's Electronic Learning Community	Albany, NY	1994	Planning	Community Networking
Oklahoma Department of Commerce	Oklahoma City, OK	1995	Demonstration	Public Services
Project InterLinc	Lincoln, NE	1995	Access	Community Networking
Project NETmobile	Edinburg, TX	1995	Demonstration	ECLL
Project Rural-Urban Network	Louisville, KY	1995	Demonstration	ECLL
Quality Educational Scholastic Trust, Inc.	Pittsfield, MA	1995	Access	ECLL
SafetyNet—New Hampshire	Concord, NH	1995	Access	Public Services
South Carolina's Information Highway	Columbia, SC	1994	Planning	Community Networking
SmartCities	Kansas City, MO	1994	Planning	Community Networking
Trans-Border Information Technology Collaborative	El Paso, TX	1994	Planning	Public Services
Tri-State Network Demonstration Project	Starkville, MS	1994	Demonstration	ECLL
Western Brokering Project	Boulder, CO	1994	Planning	ECLL



# **Appendix B**

## **Mail Survey for Demonstration and Access Projects**



# **Appendix C**

## **Mail Survey for Planning Projects**

