1. The proposed collection of information is necessary to measure the effect of housing mobility-related services on housing voucher families' access to high-opportunity locations and compare the various groups involved in the process, i.e., household residents, landlords, and organization staff. By inviting all parties into the conversation and providing the chance to share their insights about the program and their lived experiences increases trust, reliability, and validity (Guy & Eli, 2018; Martin-West et al., 2019). Effectively measuring this program simultaneously builds accountability and transparency with the public (Guy & Eli, 2018). The mix of qualitative and quantitative data creates a more comprehensive evaluation to determine whether the goals are being met and learn from all aspects of the experience (Guy & Eli, 2018). Analysis of administrative records leads to additional quantitative measures, including demographic characteristics.
2. According to the information provided, the two-part study takes place over the course of six years. This timing seems necessary given the evaluation and ability to accurately measure how mobility-related services affect the share of Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) holders with children that move to lower-poverty areas. A more detailed timeline of the process, including the intended usage of the information, would increase transparency.
3. The agency's assessment of the time burden and ability to sustain participation over time seems low.
4. Ensuring research includes sites across various demographics with household, community, and cultural effects will create a more comprehensive evidence-based database. Keeping a collection of data results and stories up to date, accessible, and presented in an easy-to-use format will increase accountability and transparency with the public (Baker & Martin-West, 2020; Guy & Eli, 2018). The secondary outcomes evaluated through interviews should provide further insight into overall wellbeing, particularly on effects not previously measured or assessed in connection with the mobility-related services such as family dynamics and parenting, food insecurity, material hardship, perceived stress, and wellbeing (Karpman et al., 2018). With

relocation involved, measuring the psychological health and overall wellbeing concerning the neighborhood and community culture is essential (McCabe, 2018). Depending on the location of the sites, it could be challenging to determine how the mobility-related services impact the benefits of residents in different states or counties because of the decentralized model of social safety net services in the United States (Baker & Martin-West, 2020). The quality of information improves when determining how this program correlates with social welfare benefits. Overall, the evaluation outcomes need to indicate the level of cost-effectiveness and the program's equity (Guy & Eli, 2018; Stone, 2012).

5. Permitting electronic submission of responses should increase efficiency. Electronic communication needs to be mobile-friendly and securely store data (Guy & Eli, 2018). In addition, the option to fill surveys out in person and the ability to call and text participants leads to increased responses. The agency can address the burden of time through incentives to sustain participation throughout the evaluation. Establishing relationships with the participants builds trust and leads to more accountability and transparency throughout the process. Maintaining communication with participants and the community during the process balances autonomy, control, and cooperation throughout implementation with regular check-ins and the option to decline participation at any point (Guy & Eli, 2018).

References

Martin-West, S., Baker, A. C.., Balakrishnan, S., Rao, K., & You, G.T. (2019*). Pre-Analysis Plan: Stockton Economic Improvement Demonstration*. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/6039d612b17d055cac14070f/t/605029f652a6b53e3dd3 9044/1615866358804/SEED+Pre-analysis+Plan.pdf

Guy, M. E., & Ely, T. L. (2018). *Essentials of public service: An introduction to contemporary public administration* (1st ed.). Melvin & Leigh, Publishers.

Baker A. C. & Martin-West, S. (2020). *Learning agenda.* Center for Guaranteed Income Research. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5fdc101bc3cfda2dcf0a2244/t/6154b24ace569e3443f38db6/1632940618620/Center%2BFor%2BGuaranteed%2BIncome%2BResearch%2BLearning%2BAgenda.pdf

Karpman, M., Gonzalez, D., Zuckerman, S., & Adams, G. (2018, December 20). What explains the widespread material hardship among low-income families with children? Urban Institute. https://www.urban.org/research/publication/what-explains-widespread-material-hardshipamong-low-income-families-children

McCabe, B. J. (2018). Why buy a home? Race, ethnicity, and homeownership preferences in the United States. Sociology of Race and Ethnicity, 4(4), 452–472. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649217753648

Stone, D. (2012). *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making* (3rd ed.). W.W. Norton & Company.