Request for OMB Review and Approval Supporting Statement

HOPE II: Faith Based and Community Organization Program Evaluation Study

Analytic Support Program
Contract TR-017

August 28, 2006

Prepared for
Carrie F. Mulford
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
810 7th Street NW
Washington, DC 20531

Prepared by
Abt Associates Inc.

Abt Associates Inc.

Cambridge, MA
Lexington, MA
Hadley, MA
Bethesda, MD
Chicago, IL

Abt Associates Inc.
Suite 800 North
4550 Montgomery Avenue
Bethesda, MD 20814-3343

Abstract

Each year there are more than one million violent crimes (e.g., robbery, assault, sexual assault, and homicide) and over a million property crimes (e.g., larceny, burglary, arson) reported to law enforcement agencies in the United States. Victimization surveys indicate that the actual incidence is far higher, since only a small percentage of crime victims report these events to police.[1]

Crime has a number of profound negative effects on victims and their families, with the kinds of impacts depending on the type of crime, its severity, and other circumstances.[2] Property crime can create financial hardships in trying to replace or do without what was stolen or damaged, and nearly all crimes create some level of negative psychological impact, such as feelings of personal violation, distrust of others, anger, and increased fear of crime. Violent crimes can create an array of psychological and emotional effects such as depression, suicide or suicidal ideation, and sleep and eating disorders. Combinations of symptoms are diagnosable as disorders, such as Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD)[3] or Rape Trauma Syndrome.[4] According to a 1987 National Institute of Justice study addressing lifetime trends among victims of crime, researchers found that 28 percent of all crime victims subsequently developed crime-related PTSD.

Considering the array of traumas that victims of violent crimes experience, it is clear that a myriad of services are needed to ameliorate the long- and short-term effects associated with victimization. A series of legislative acts have been passed over the years to improve victim support services. Recently, the federal government has focused attention on the unique position of faith-based and community organizations (FBCOs) to address local needs by delivering critical services to victims of crime. Most recently, the federal government has launched a national initiative to expand opportunities for FBCOs to compete for federal funds through the establishment of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives and Faith-Based Centers in ten federal agencies, including the Department of Justice.

---

1 Federal Bureau of Investigation. Department of Justice. Crime in the United States 2005. Available online at: http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs.

2 Kilpatrick, D. G., B. E. Saunders, L. J. Veronen, C. L. Best, and J. M. Von, "Criminal Victimization: Lifetime Prevalence, Reporting to Police, and Psychological Impact." *Crime and Delinquency* 33 (4): 479-489, 1987; McCann, L., and L. A. Pearlman, *Psychological Trauma and the Adult Survivor: Theory, Therapy & Transformation*, New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1987; Resick, P. A., "The Psychological Impact of Rape," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 8 (2): 223-255, 1993; Resick, P. A., *Reactions of Female and Male Victims of Rape or Robbery.* Final report of NIMH grant no. MH 37296, May 1986; Rose, S., and J. Bisson, "Brief Early Psychological Interventions Following Trauma: A Systematic Review of the Literature," *Journal of Traumatic Stress* 11 (4): 697-710, 1998; Norris, F. H., and K. Kaniasty, "Psychological Distress Following Criminal Victimization in the General Population: Cross-sectional, Longitudinal, and Prospective Analyses," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 62 (1): 111-123, 1994; Weaver, T. L. and G. A. Clum, "Psychological Distress Associated with Interpersonal Violence: A Meta-Analysis," *Clinical Psychology Review* 15 (2): 115-140, 1995.

3 E.g., Kilpatrick, "Criminal Victimization;" Young, M., "The Crime Victims' Movement," in F Ochberg (Ed.), *Post-traumatic Therapy and Victims of Violence*, New York: Brunner-Mazel, 1998.

4 Zoellner L.A., Goodwin M.L., Foa E.B., "PTSD Severity and Health Perceptions in Female Victims of Sexual Assault," *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 13(4), 635-649, 2000; Jennings, Anne, *The Damaging Consequences of Violence and Trauma*, U.S Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2003.

Within the Department of Justice, the Office of Victims of Crime (OVC) launched the Helping Outreach Programs to Expand II: Faith-Based and Community Organization Program (HOPE II Program) in 2002. This second iteration of the HOPE grant program is directed at providing grants to support organizations that offer services to victims of crime within urban and high-crime areas. OVC has allocated $3.0 million to the HOPE II Program to support small FBCOs. This money has been awarded to an intermediary organization that has made sub-grants of up to $50,000 to small FBCOs to provide services to victims of crime in Spring 2006. The intermediary will also be responsible for providing training and technical assistance to strengthen service delivery and organizational capacity of the sub-grantees.

Consistent with its commitment to performance measurement, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) has integrated an evaluation component into the program initiative. The objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Determine the type and quality of training and technical assistance (TA) that FBCOs receive from the intermediary.
- Assess the results of TA provided to FBCOs by the intermediary and the extent to which it has enhanced organizational and direct service capacity.
- Assess the process for distributing sub-grants and the extent to which it has been instrumental in increasing the organizational or service capacity of FBCOs.
- Identify the intermediary's most effective strategies for promoting enhanced service delivery and organizational capacity among FBCOs.
- Identify specific areas in which FBCOs have experienced the greatest improvements in organizational and service capacity and determine the factors that are most responsible.

The study consists of two evaluation components: 1) an outcomes evaluation to determine the extent to which the financial and technical assistance received by FBCOs has increased their capacity to effectively deliver services to victims of crime; and 2) a process evaluation to gain a detailed understanding of the service delivery system as it is implemented through the FBCOs with the support of the MCVRC. This OMB application addresses the outcomes evaluation portion of the study.

The outcomes evaluation will include two data collection efforts: 1) a survey of funded FBCOs and a comparison-group of non-funded FBCOs, surveyed 10 months and 20 months from award; and 2) a brief survey of crime victims that received services from one of the funded FBCOs during the grant period. In addition, administrative records on victims and services that are being collected by grantees through the use of a case management data system will be used to supplement the survey data.

A. Justification

A1. Circumstances Making the Data Collection Necessary

Considering the array of traumas that victims of violent crimes experience, it is clear that a myriad of services are needed to ameliorate the long- and short-term effects associated with victimization. A

series of legislative acts have been passed over the years to improve victim support services. Recently, the federal government has focused attention on the unique position of faith-based and community organizations (FBCOs) to address local needs by delivering critical services to victims of crime. Most recently, the federal government has launched a national initiative to expand opportunities for FBCOs to compete for federal funds through the establishment of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives and Faith-Based Centers in ten federal agencies, including the Department of Justice.

Within the Department of Justice, the Office of Victims of Crime (OVC) launched the Helping Outreach Programs to Expand II: Faith-Based and Community Organization Program (HOPE II Program) in 2002. A second iteration of the HOPE grant program is directed at providing funds and technical assistance to small faith-based and community organizations (FBCOs) that offer services to victims of crime within urban and high-crime areas.

Consistent with its commitment to performance measurement, the Department of Justice has integrated an evaluation component into the HOPE II program initiative, *the Helping Outreach Programs to Expand II: Faith-Based and Community Organization Program Evaluation Study*. The National Institute of Justice within the Department of Justice is sponsoring the evaluation of this phase of the HOPE II grant program. Abt Associates, Inc. has been awarded a contract to evaluate the HOPE II program.

The cornerstone of the HOPE II program is the distribution and oversight of a sub-awards program to local faith-based and community organizations by an intermediary, the Maryland Crime Victims' Resource Center, Inc. (MCVRC). The intermediary will serve as a bridge between the federal government and FBCOs. Intermediaries provide support to FBCOs through direct funding (sub-grants/sub-awards), technical assistance (TA), and training. Sub-grants of approximately $50,000 were distributed to 29 sub-grantees in high crime urban areas (a total amount of approximately $1.45 million) in Spring 2006. The specific purposes of the grants are to:

- Increase the number of crime victims served in the target community;
- Increase training opportunities for service providers; and
- Increase the ability of agencies to collaborate and form networks with other providers.

The research approach for the evaluation of this grant program is organized around two primary research phases, a process evaluation and an outcomes evaluation. The purpose of the process study is to gain a detailed understanding of the service delivery system as it is implemented through the FBCOs with the support of the MCVRC. The primary source of information for the process evaluation is a set of site visits to a representative sample of up to nine FBCOs**.** The purpose of the outcomes evaluation is to determine the extent to which the financial and technical assistance received by FBCOs has increased their capacity to effectively deliver services to victims of crime. In addition to these two primary sources of data, basic demographic information on the number of victims served, the types of services offered, etc. will be collected by the grantees through a case management data system. This OMB application addresses the outcomes evaluation portion of the study.

The proposed data collection for the outcomes evaluation is intended to support an evaluation of the effect of intermediary organization services on the organizational capacity of the FBCOs they

support. This evaluation is an important opportunity to examine the effectiveness of the HOPE II program in meeting its objective of improving the capacity of FBCOs that serve victims of crime.

As summarized in Exhibit 1, the outcomes evaluation will include two data collection efforts. The survey of organizations will involve all funded FBCOs and a comparison-group of non-funded FBCOs. The organizations will be surveyed 10 months and 20 months from award. In addition to the survey information, basic demographic information on the number of victims served, the types of services offered, etc. will be collected directly from a case management data system used by the grantees. This information will be used to supplement the survey data on grantees. The second data collection will involve a brief survey of crime victims that received services from one of the 29 funded FBCOs during the grant period. It is anticipated that client satisfaction surveys will be returned from an average of 290 clients across the 29 FBCOs.

Survey	Design	# FBCOs / Clients	Funding Cycle	Data Collection	Survey Administration	Timing
Organization	Pre/Post with comparison	58	2005	Two post surveys	Self-administered and telephone interview	Spring 2007, Winter 2008
Client	One-time survey	290	2005	One-time	Self-administered	Winter 2007

A2. Purpose and Use of the Information Collection

The HOPE II program is one of a number of programs the Office of Victims of Crime has implemented as part of its mission to promote greater participation of FBCOs in criminal justice programs. The information collected through the proposed data collection activity will be critical to the evaluation, the results of which will allow OVC to, if necessary, make adjustments to the administration of the HOPE II program to better serve FBCOs and, ultimately, the crime victims they serve.

Follow-up Surveys

All organizations applying for HOPE II grant funds were required to submit information on staffing, organization services, funding, and community engagement. The information provided will serve as a baseline. One of the two data collection activities will be gathering follow-up data from FBCOs. The follow-up data collection provides information on outcomes achieved by FBCOs during their participation in the HOPE II Program in comparison to FBCOs who did not participate. Two follow-up periods and self-administered survey instruments will be implemented: the first data collection will be immediately after the HOPE II Program ends (10 months after sub-grants are distributed); and another data collection will take place 10 months after participation in the program has ended (20 months after sub-grants are distributed). The first data collection will focus on the more immediate short-term outcomes for FBCOs. The second data collection will be used to detect the longer-term results that are the goals of the HOPE II Program in the areas of capacity-building and service delivery.

Specifically, the follow-up data collection effort will be designed to answer the following questions:

- How has the FBCOs' service delivery changed between baseline and follow-up periods?
- How have the FBCOs' organizational capabilities changed between baseline and follow-up periods?
- How have the FBCOs' priorities and practices changed between baseline and follow-up periods?
- What partnerships and cooperative agreements have been put in place to support the program?
- How do the changes observed in sub-grantees' results and practices differ from those observed in the FBCOs in the comparison group?
- Do outcomes differ across various program types and grantee characteristics?

The data collected as part of the follow-up surveys will facilitate the outcomes evaluation of the HOPE II sub-grant awards. Please see Appendix B to review the 10-month follow-up surveys and Appendix C to review the 20-month follow-up survey.

Victim Satisfaction Survey

Data will also be collected from victims receiving services from one of the 29 FBCOs that received a HOPE II sub-grant through a self-administered survey. This data collection will attempt to address the following issues:

- Quality and utility of services,
- Perceived helpfulness of services, and
- Overall satisfaction with service experience

The proposed research design calls for distributing questionnaires and gathering data on an ongoing basis for the last three months of the 10-month sub-grant. Based on this premise it's anticipated that Abt Associates, Inc. will receive a total of approximately 290 completed questionnaires across all 29 sub-grantees. If this estimate is not reached, Abt Associates, Inc. will work with the intermediary, MCVRC, to increase the response rate.

A part of the evaluation addresses the issue of victim satisfaction with services received. To this end, data received from the victim satisfaction survey will be aggregated, summarized, and presented descriptively for the universe of respondents. This information will facilitate an assessment of program success from the clients' perspective. See Appendix D to review the victim satisfaction survey.

A3. Use of Information Technology and Burden Reduction

Follow-up Surveys

Advanced technologies will not be employed to collect this information. Organization representatives will either receive a paper survey in the mail and be given the necessary postage fees to return it to Abt Associates, Inc. at no cost to the respondent, or respondents will receive a phone call from a

trained Abt staff person and asked to complete an interview over the telephone. This is an appropriate strategy, as many community-based organizations do not have Internet access.

Victim Satisfaction Survey

Organization representatives will distribute a stamped pre-addressed survey postcard to clients after receipt of services. Given the target population and the nature of services that clients are likely to have received, feedback on services is best collected immediately after receipt of services. Skepticism with regard to the confidentiality of on-line surveys further establishes that a paper survey is the best approach for encouraging participation.

A4. Efforts to Identify Duplication and Use of Similar Information

A formal outcomes evaluation of the HOPE II Program has never been conducted. The information proposed to be collected from grant recipients is not contained in any existing databases.

A5. Impact on Small Businesses or Other Small Entities

This information collection will have no impact on small businesses or other small private entities. Respondents will be nonprofit faith- and community-based organizations and private individuals.

A6. Consequences of Collecting Information Less Frequently or Not At All

The two follow-up surveys and victim satisfaction survey are essential to conducting an evaluation of the HOPE II Program. The follow-up instruments will seek to identify and measure changes in knowledge and awareness about capacity issues, as well as changes in practice. Organizational change among FBCOs is often a slow process. It takes time for managers of FBCOs to convert new knowledge and resources into new organizational practices. It is, therefore, important to conduct two follow-up surveys (one at 10 months and one at 20 months) in order to determine how the effects of the HOPE II sub-grant develop and are sustained over time.

Without the collection of information about the organization at multiple points in time from both a program and comparison group, there would be no way to isolate the results of the services provided to FBCOs by the intermediary during the early years of program operations. It is also important to collect victim satisfaction information in order to have some measure of satisfaction with new or enhanced services.

A7. Special Circumstances Relating to the Guidelines of 5 CFR 1320.5

The proposed data collection complies fully with the guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.5 (Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements: Final Rule). The proposed study will require no deviation from the guidelines.

A8. Comments in Response to the Federal Register Notice and Efforts to Consult Outside Agency

A. A 60 day notice to solicit public comments was published in the *Federal Register*, April 17, 2006 (Volume 71, Number 81). No comments were received.

B. A 30 day notice to solicit public comments was published in the *Federal Register*, July 3, 2006 (Volume 71, Number 127). No comments were received.

The instruments were developed by the Abt Associates research team, comprising: Dr. Carrie Markovitz; Glen Schneider; Meg Chapman; Lisa Magged; Caity Baxter; and Dr. William Ryan, a research fellow at Harvard University's Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations. The instruments were also reviewed by staff at the Maryland Crime Victims Resource Center (MCVRC) (the intermediary) and expert consultants working with MCVRC on the project. Both instruments were reviewed by Dr. Carrie Mulford from the National Institute of Justice.

A9. Explanation of Any Payment or Gift to Respondents

A small incentive (such as a book or DVD on nonprofit capacity building for FBCOs) will be provided to FBCO respondents to offset the burden of completing the questionnaire. In past work, Abt Associates, Inc. has found a small incentive to be important in achieving high response rates.

No incentive or gift will be provided to respondents completing the brief victim satisfaction survey.

A10. Assurance of Confidentiality Provided to Respondents

FBCO respondents will be asked to give information about the agency in which they are employed. No personal information, aside from name and job position, will be requested from FBCO respondents. No assurance of anonymity will be given, as the surveys will collect contact information. However, individual FBCOs will never be identified and reports will only be in the aggregate – so the information will be confidential.

No personal information or contact information will be asked of respondents to the victim satisfaction survey. All responses will concern desired service and perception of services provided.

Hard-copies of all data collection forms will be delivered to a locked area at Abt Associates, Inc. for receipt and processing. Abt Associates, Inc. maintains restricted access to all data preparation areas (i.e., receipt, coding, data entry). All data files on multi-user systems will be under the control of a database manager, with access limited to project staff on a "need-to-know" basis only.

Individual identifying information will be maintained separately from completed data collection forms and from computerized data files used for analysis. No respondent identifiers will be contained in public use files made available from the study, and no data will be released in a form that identifies individuals.

We are familiar with, and prepared to comply with: the Privacy Act of 1974, P.L. 93-579, 5 USC 552 a; the Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 522; the Department of Justice (DOJ) regulations at 28

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 22 requiring recipients of NIJ research funds to protect personally identifiable information that is collected from all research participants; and as appropriate, the Federal "common rule" regulations on protection of human research subjects, the same as those established by the Department of Health and Human Services in 45 CFR Part 46, Subpart A.

A11. Justification for Sensitive Questions

No questions of a personal nature are included in the surveys.

A12. Estimates of Hour Burden Including Annualized Costs

NIJ and Abt Associates, Inc. estimate the follow-up surveys will take an average of 25 minutes per respondent to complete. Based on an estimated 116 total respondents (approximately 58 for the 10 month follow-up and 58 for the 20 month follow-up), the time burden is estimated to be 25 hours annually or 49 hours total. Annual salary and compensation for respondents is estimated to be $34,880, or $16.77 per hour, for FBCO directors resulting in an approximate cost of $817.03 in total cost to respondent FBCOs, or $7.04 per completed interview. Annualized, the approximate total cost to respondents is $408.52. Please see Exhibit 2.

NIJ and Abt Associates, Inc. estimate that the victim satisfaction survey will take an average of 3 minutes per respondent to complete. Based on an estimated 290 total respondents, the time burden is estimated to be 15 hours per year. Annual salary and compensation for respondents is difficult to estimate since respondents may be unemployed or employed across various industries. However, using the national mean annual wage across industries[5], which is $37,440, or $18.00 per hour, results in an approximate cost of $261.00 in total cost to victim respondents, or $.90 per completed interview.

[5] As reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics November 2004 National Cross-Industry Estimates http://www.bls.gov/oes/oes_dl.htm

Exhibit 2

Estimates of Burden Hours and Cost

Data Collection Sources	Number of Respondents	Hours Per Respondent	Response Burden in Hours	Estimated Cost Per Hour	Costs per Respondent	Total Burden (Costs)
Surveys of FBCOs	116	.42 hours (25 minutes)	49	$16.77[a]	$7.04	$817.03
Client Satisfaction Survey	290	.05 hours (3 minutes)	15	$18.00[b]	$.90	$261.00

Notes:

[a] Estimated cost per hour is calculated based on the mean annual wage of community/social service directors as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics November 2004 National Cross-Industry Estimates.

[b] Estimated cost per hour is calculated based on the national mean annual wage across industries as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics November 2004 National Cross-Industry Estimates.

A13. Estimate of Other Total Annual Cost Burden to Respondents or Recordkeepers

Respondents and recordkeepers will bear no additional costs.

A14. Annualized Cost to the Federal Government

The information collection activities have been developed in the performance of the U.S. Department of Justice Services Contract Number TR-017. The period of performance is September 2005 - December 2007. The total cost to the Federal government is $401,980. Of that total, approximately $52,174 (or 13 percent) will be used for the data collection activities for which clearance is requested.

A15. Explanation for Program Changes or Adjustments

No changes or adjustments have been made; this is a new collection.

A16. Plans for Tabulation and Publication and Project Time Schedule

Abt Associates, Inc. will collect, tabulate and report findings from the follow-up and victim satisfaction surveys. The schedule shown below displays the sequence of activities required to conduct this information collection activity and includes key dates for activities related to data collection, analysis and reporting. Abt Associates, Inc. will develop a final report in June 2008.

Exhibit 3

Time Schedule

Activities and Deliverables	Date
Victim Satisfaction Survey	January-March 2007
First Follow-up Data Collection	March-April 2007
Second Follow-up Data Collection	January-February 2008
Data Analysis	April-May 2008
Reporting	June 2008

A17. Reason(s) Display of OMB Expiration Date is Inappropriate

No such exemption is requested.

A18. Exceptions to Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

No such exemption is requested.

B. Collections of Information Employing Statistical Methods

This evaluation is designed with the understanding that the goal of capacity building programs for faith-based and community organizations is to equip participating organizations to acquire a sustainable stream of resources (including money, knowledge, and talent). These increased resources, combined with clear goals and plans, will enable FBCOs to deliver effective and increased resources to people in need, which includes victims of crime.[6] More specifically, this capacity includes three broad areas: management and leadership, sustainable funding, and service capacity. The federal contractor, Abt Associates, Inc., will employ statistical methods to examine these major areas, which are covered in the follow-up survey instruments. Additionally, because of the focus on the provision of services to victims of crime, the victim satisfaction surveys will also be analyzed to gauge perception of services among those receiving services during and after the grant period.

B1. Respondent Universe and Sampling Methods

A total of 181 FBCOs applied to the intermediary, MCVRC, for HOPE II funding. The intermediary, which is responsible for awarding sub-grants, applied a scoring method to determine which applicants receive sub-grants. The intermediary awarded approximately 29 sub-grants in May 2006. These 29 sub-grantees are included in our program group as study participants. Additionally, our comparison group will consist of FBCOs that applied for sub-grants and did not receive them. Twenty-nine FBCOs that applied for sub-grants will be randomly selected for the comparison group. The comparison group will be randomly selected from FBCOs with similar characteristics to the sub-grant recipients. These characteristics will include organizations with no previous federal funding, which provide services in an urban environment and serve previously under-served populations.

The client satisfaction survey will only be administered to victims receiving services through the 29 sub-grantees. All clients who are seeking services in response to a victimization during a specific time period (January-March 2007) will be given a satisfaction survey by the organization after receipt of services.

B2. Procedures for the Collection of Information

Follow-up Surveys

The follow-up surveys will be conducted primarily by mail and telephone. Two survey instruments will be implemented over two follow-up periods: 1) the first data collection will be immediately after the HOPE II Program ends (10 months after sub-grants were distributed); and 2) another data collection will take place 10 months after participation in the program has ended (20 months after sub-grants were distributed). Contact information will be gathered from the HOPE II grant

[6] This formulation of nonprofit capacity is consistent with, for example: P. Brinkerhoff, *Mission-Based* Management (Dillon, CO: Alpine Guild, Inc., 1994); P. Drucker, *Managing the Nonprofit Organization: Practices and Principles* (New York: HarperBusiness, 1992); M. Hudson, *Managing Without Profit: The Art of Managing Third Sector Organizations* (London: Penguin Books, 1999); and C. W. Letts, W. P. Ryan, and A. Grossman, *High-Performance Nonprofit Organizations* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1999).

applications and will be automatically linked to a survey ID number. At the end of the HOPE II grant program (10 months after sub-grants were distributed) a self-administered survey will be mailed to key staff members at the HOPE II sub-grantees . Respondents will be provided with a pre-addressed postage-paid envelope for the return of completed surveys. Abt Associates, Inc. will contact FBCOs by telephone, if necessary, to prompt respondents to complete and return their surveys. At this same time, key staff at the FBCOs in the comparison group will be contacted via telephone to complete a similar survey with a trained Abt survey interviewer. A small incentive (such as a book or DVD on nonprofit capacity building for FBCOs) will be provided to respondents.

The second data collection will take place 10 months after participation in the program has ended (20 months after sub-grants were distributed). Key staff at both the sub-grantees in the program group and FBCOs in the comparison group will be contacted and interviewed via telephone by an Abt survey interviewer to complete the second follow-up survey.

Victim Satisfaction Survey

Victim satisfaction information will be collected through surveys administered to victims receiving services from one of the 29 FBCOs that received a HOPE II sub-grant. The victim satisfaction survey will be printed on a postcard stamped and addressed to Abt Associates, Inc. and distributed to FBCOs receiving HOPE II funding. After receiving services from an FBCO, victims will receive a survey from FBCO staff. The survey will consist of six questions that can be included on a 5X6 piece of paper that can be folded over to postcard-size. The back of the survey will be stamped and pre-addressed to Abt Associates, Inc. Respondents will be asked to provide their responses and place the postcard in the mail. Responses will be hidden inside the folded over postcard when mailed back to Abt Associates, Inc. There will be no identifying information on the postcards, except an internal Abt identifier to identify the FBCO from which they received services.

B3. Methods to Maximize Response Rates and Deal With Non-response

Abt Associates, Inc. has extensive experience in conducting mail and phone surveys. We anticipate a minimum response rate of 80 percent of sub-grantees and comparison FBCOs. As described above, we will mail the survey to key staff at FBCOs that have received sub-grants (program group), and we will telephone key staff at FBCOs who applied for, but did not receive sub-grants (comparison group). A second mailing will be sent to non-respondents in the program group a few weeks later. Follow-up phone calls may also be placed to sub-grantees to encourage response. Because a response to the follow-up survey is required by grantees, we expect close to a 100 percent response rate from the grantee group. However, in some cases a grantee organization may no longer exist at follow-up (i.e., go out of business) or key staff who are most knowledgeable of changes to the organization over time may no longer be employed at the surveyed organization. For this reason, we may not achieve the full 100 percent response rate.

Key staff from FBCOs in the comparison group will be contacted by telephone to complete the first follow-up interview since they will have had no involvement with the HOPE II program since applying more than a year ago. We believe the use of a telephone interview rather than a mailed, self-administered survey will encourage a response rate of close to 80 percent. In addition, FBCOs in both the program and comparison groups will be contacted via telephone for the 20-month follow-up data

collection to maximize the response rate after having no involvement in the grant program for between 10-24 months. Further, to increase response rates, the contractor will also offer a gift (such as a book or DVD on nonprofit capacity building for FBCOs) valued at about $25.00 as an incentive for survey completion.

Estimating anticipated response rates for the victim satisfaction survey is complicated by the fact that information on client flow is not available at this time, particularly since providing services to victims will be new to many of the sub-grantees. However, we believe the brevity of the survey instrument, the convenience of the postcard administration, and the anonymous nature of the data collection will all encourage high response rates (at least 80%).

B4. Test of Procedures or Methods to be Undertaken

The instruments were pre-tested with MCVRC staff and six expert consultants working with MCVRC on the project. Consultants further tested the instrument by administering it to representatives from at least one FBCO they were working with at the time. Feedback was reviewed and areas needing revision were identified and changes were made, as appropriate.

B5. Individuals Consulted on Statistical Aspects and Individuals Collecting and/or Analyzing Data

Exhibit 4

Individuals Consulted

	Organization	Telephone
Statistical Consultants:		
Carrie Markovitz	Abt Associates, Inc.	(301) 634-1807
Glen Schneider	Abt Associates, Inc	(617) 349-2471
Carrie Mulford	National Institute of Justice	(202) 307-2959
Data Analysts:		
Carrie Markovitz	Abt Associates, Inc.	(301) 634-1807
Glen Schneider	Abt Associates, Inc	(617) 349-2471
Meg Chapman	Abt Associates, Inc	(301) 634-1740
Lisa Magged	Abt Associates, Inc	(312) 867-4035
Caity Baxter	Abt Associates, Inc	(301) 634-1785

Appendices

Appendix A: Paperwork Certification Statement
Appendix B: 10-Month Follow-up Surveys and PRA Burden Statement
Appendix C: 20-Month Follow-up Survey and PRA Burden Statement
Appendix D: Victim Satisfaction Survey and PRA Burden Statement
Appendix E: Authority Mandating the Collection of Information
Appendix F: 60 Day Federal Register Notice
Appendix G: 30 Day Federal Register Notice
Appendix H: DOJ's Regulation on Confidentiality

Appendix A:
Paperwork Certification Statement

Appendix B:
10-Month Follow-up Surveys and PRA Burden Statement

Appendix C:
20-Month Follow-up Survey and PRA Burden Statement

Appendix D:
Victim Satisfaction Survey and PRA Burden Statement

Appendix E:
Authority Mandating the Collection of Information

Appendix F:
60 Day Federal Register Notice

Appendix G:
30 Day Federal Register Notice

Appendix H:
DOJ's Regulation on Confidentiality