

Mentoring Children of Prisoners Data Collection Process
(Quarterly Caseload Data Report)

OMB # 0970-0266

Supporting Statement

**Family and Youth Services Bureau
Administration on Children, Youth and Families
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services**

June, 2007

Table of Contents

A. Justification

1.	Circumstances that Make the Collection of Information Necessary	3
2.	Use of Data	3
3.	Use of Improved Information Technology to Reduce Burden	3
4.	Efforts to Identify Duplication	3
5.	Methods to Minimize Burden	4
6.	Consequences to Federal Programs or Policy Activities	4
6a.	If the Collection of Information is not Conducted	4
6b.	If the Information is Collected Less Frequently	4
7.	Special Circumstances	4
8.	Public Comments	4
8a.	Federal Register	4
8b.	Efforts to Consult with Persons Outside the Agency	4
9.	Payment or Gifts to Respondents	4
10.	Assurance of Confidentiality	4
11.	Justification of Questions of a Sensitive Nature.	5
12.	Estimate of Respondent Burden (Exhibit 3)	5
13.	Estimate of Annualized Cost Burden to Respondent (Exhibit 4)	5
14.	Estimate of Annualized Cost to Federal Government (Exhibit 5)	5
15.	Reasons for Change in Burden	6
16.	Tabulation and Publication	6
16a.	Plans for the Tabulation and Statistical Analysis	6
16b.	Publications	7
16c.	Project Time Schedule	7
17.	Expiration Date	7
B.	Collection of Information Employing Statistical Methods	7
EXHIBIT 1:	Legislation and regulations	8

A. Justification

1. Circumstances that Make the Collection of Information Necessary: The Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006 amends Title IV–B of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629– 629e) to provide funding for nonprofit agencies that recruit, screen, train, and support mentors for children with an incarcerated parent or parents. The Mentoring Children of Prisoners program (MCP) is administered by the Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB) of the Administration for Children and Families in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

The legislation includes requirements for grantees to meet goals for children matched, which are negotiated after the award is given. It also requires grantees to provide information that can be used to evaluate outcomes for participating children, including information necessary to demonstrate compliance with requirements established by the Secretary for the program.

The legislation also requires the Secretary to evaluate the programs and report to Congress. The data will supplement evaluation activities and is designed to provide key indicators of relationship quality to established models of mentoring effectiveness.

2. Use of Data: Data will be analyzed to drive training and technical assistance, identify targets, monitor progress, and implement strategies to achieve goals. FYSB will need this information to assure effective service delivery and program management and to monitor ongoing caseloads, training, demographics, etc.

Finally, data from this collection will be used for reporting outcomes and efficiencies under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). It will provide input for Congressional hearings and inform philanthropic interests and research efforts in addition to FYSB's.

3. Use of Improved Information Technology to Reduce Burden: A previous design of data collection was in Microsoft Excel; now the data is collected through an Online Data Collection system which allows data to be inputted and transferred through a secure website. Grantees receive training at national conferences; they also receive updates and helpful hints through their general, monthly training and technical assistance newsletter, and emails sent from Federal staff as warranted. Additionally, grantees receive additional technical support via email and a 1-866 number and information and helpful hints are contained through the data collection instrument itself.

4. Efforts to Identify Duplication: MCP is a program that targets a very specific population. While some grantees have previous experience operating mentoring programs, including those for children of prisoners, many grantees are starting up for the first time. There is no existing system that collects the data called for or implied by the authorizing legislation.

Moreover, the data in this form is being collected from the same grantees by no other part of FYSB. Grantees routinely provide financial and narrative progress reports, and onsite monitoring protocols are under consideration, but the information in all these areas will be unique and distinct from the present collection.

5. Methods to Minimize Burden: FYSB's approach to data collection and reporting is to minimize paperwork, eliminate unnecessary duplication, and allow service providers to spend most of their time providing services.

6. Consequences to Federal Programs or Policy Activities

6a. If the Collection of Information is not Conducted: FYSB continues to use the data to monitor the program's growth and performance; the data is used as a primary tool for grantee oversight and drives the training and technical assistance plan. The data is used to report to Congress on the program's effectiveness, as mandated by the authorizing legislation and to meet GPRA requirements. It will be unable to manage the achievement of targets, identify barriers to service effectiveness and other areas of concern, or focus technical assistance and monitoring.

6b. If the Information is Collected Less Frequently: FYSB needs to continue to monitor the progress of the program and individual grantees. Match relationship terminations and rematch waiting list durations can have a major impact on youth development and are tracked on a quarterly basis. For example, a termination, even if not initiated by the mentor, can be seen by a child as rejection or abandonment, which they may already have felt when their father or mother was taken away to imprisonment. Additionally, match relationships that involve significantly fewer than weekly meetings of approximately one hour are troubling since they indicate a mentor may not be living up to his/her commitment. By comparing these factors with information about how many mentors the agency has retrained or counseled about their responsibility, we can learn early on whether an agency is staying on top of circumstances crucial to a child's successful mentoring experience.

7. Special Circumstances: None are applicable.

8. Public comments

8a. Federal Register: On April 11, 2007 the first notice was published in the Federal Register, page 19208-19209, Vol. 72, Number 73. A copy of the first Federal Register notice is provided below.

8b. Efforts to Consult with Persons Outside the Agency: The original instrument design was done after consulting with grantees and experts in the field of mentoring. During the Federal Register notice time, no requests came for a copy of the instrument, and no public comments were received.

9. Payment or Gifts to Respondents: There is no remuneration of any kind for respondents.

10. Assurance of Confidentiality: This instrument only acquires aggregate caseload information. Protection of privacy and individual case files is a responsibility of the agency, but FYSB may examine agency diligence in this regard through onsite monitoring or other means.

11. Justification of Questions of a Sensitive Nature: There are no questions in this instrument that are either sensitive or focused upon single individuals.

12. Estimates of Respondent Burden:

ANNUAL BURDEN ESTIMATES

Instrument	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondent	Average burden hours per response	Total burden hours
MCP Online Data Collection	238	4	12	11,424

13. Estimates of Annualized Cost Burden to Respondent:

Task / Item	Annual Number	Annual Cost Per Respondent	Estimated Annual Cost
Training: Not needed. If form instructions are not well understood, grantees are encouraged to call technical support.	FYSB for guidance.		\$0
Hardware: A basic computer with internet capability and connection. This is a one-time cost to each grantee, if it does not already have the appropriate hardware (cost based on depreciating value consistent over three years)..	238	\$150	\$35,700
System Maintenance	238	\$100	\$23,800
Supplies (Diskettes, Mail, etc)	238	\$0	\$0
Personnel (@ \$20/hr)	238	\$960	\$228,480
Total for all 238 grantees			\$287,980

14. Estimates of Annualized Cost to Federal Government:

Task / Item	Estimated Annual Cost
Contractor provides supplemental technical support and develops special applications	\$100,000
Federal Gov't Staff (program analysis officer @ .15 FTE)	\$16,200
printing, emailing, overhead	\$1000
Total	\$117,200

15. Reasons for Change in Burden: The change in burden is to account for a change in number of the total grantees/respondents.

16. Tabulation and Publication

16a. Plans for the Tabulation and Statistical Analysis: FYSB will compile the data and, as discussed earlier in this document, e.g., under "Use of Data" and "Consequences," apply it to numerous objectives. Statistical analysis will be part of the examination of collected information.

16b. Publications: Publication of findings based on the data via print or website display or distribution as documents via electronic means is certainly a possibility so as to share information with technical assistance providers, grantees, researchers and other interested parties. The required Report to Congress of April 15, 2005, (see legislation in Exhibit 1) will become publicly available after its submission.

16c. Project Time Schedule:

FYSB submits 2 nd Federal Register Notice for publication	Late June FY07
End of 2 nd 30 day comment period	Late July FY07
Negotiate final changes with OMB	August FY07
FYSB anticipates approval from OMB, if not sooner	Late August FY07
FYSB distributes final version	September FY07
All grantees receive guidance as needed.	September FY07 – November FY08
National conference, grantees discuss data collection, receive technical assistance	November FY 08

17. Expiration Date: The requested expiration date is 3 years from the approval date.

B. Collection of Information Employing Statistical Methods: This issue is not applicable because every individual in the caseload will be included in each aggregate at the agency level, which can then be rolled up arithmetically to regional or national levels. Samples will not be used in this effort. The data will not be collected via statistical methods as explained at the end of Exhibit 3. However, any analyses of the collected data may utilize a range of quantitative methods as needed.

EXHIBIT 1: Legislative/Regulatory Authority

Public Law 109–288
109th Congress

An Act

To amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to reauthorize the promoting safe and stable families program, and for other purposes.

RESIDENCE OF THE CHILD . . .

SEC. 8. REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM FOR MENTORING CHILDREN OF PRISONERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 439 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629i) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking “2002 through 2006” and inserting “2007 through 2011”; and

(2) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) **LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2007 through 2011.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “2.5” and inserting “4”.

(b) **SERVICE DELIVERY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 439 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629i), as amended by subsection (a) of this section, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (h) and (i), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) SERVICE DELIVERY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—

“(1) PURPOSE; AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall enter into a cooperative agreement with an eligible entity that meets the requirements of paragraph (2) for the purpose of requiring the entity to conduct a demonstration project consistent with this subsection under which the entity shall—

“(A) identify children of prisoners in need of mentoring services who have not been matched with a mentor by an applicant awarded a grant under this section, with a priority for identifying children who—

“(i) reside in an area not served by a recipient of a grant under this section;

“(ii) reside in an area that has a substantial number of children of prisoners;

“(iii) reside in a rural area; or

“(iv) are Indians;

“(B) provide the families of the children so identified with—

“(i) a voucher for mentoring services that meets the requirements of paragraph (5); and

“(ii) a list of the providers of mentoring services in the area in which the family resides that satisfy the requirements of paragraph (6); and

“(C) monitor and oversee the delivery of mentoring services by providers that accept the vouchers.

“(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), an eligible entity under this subsection is an organization that the Secretary determines, on a competitive basis—

“(i) has substantial experience—

“(I) in working with organizations that provide mentoring services for children of prisoners; and

“(II) in developing quality standards for the identification and assessment of mentoring programs for children of prisoners; and

“(ii) submits an application that satisfies the requirements of paragraph (3).

“(B) LIMITATION.—An organization that provides mentoring services may not be an eligible entity for purposes of being awarded a cooperative agreement under this subsection.

“(3) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to be awarded a cooperative agreement under this subsection, an entity shall submit to the Secretary an application that includes the following:

“(A) QUALIFICATIONS.—Evidence that the entity—

“(i) meets the experience requirements of paragraph (2)(A)(i); and

“(ii) is able to carry out—

“(I) the purposes of this subsection identified in paragraph (1); and

“(II) the requirements of the cooperative agreement specified in paragraph (4).

“(B) SERVICE DELIVERY PLAN.—

“(i) DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS.—Subject to clause (iii), a description of the plan of the entity to ensure the distribution of not less than—

“(I) 3,000 vouchers for mentoring services in the first year in which the cooperative agreement is in effect with that entity;

“(II) 8,000 vouchers for mentoring services in the second year in which the agreement is in effect with that entity; and

“(III) 13,000 vouchers for mentoring services in any subsequent year in which the agreement is in effect with that entity.

“(ii) SATISFACTION OF PRIORITIES.—A description of how the plan will ensure the delivery of mentoring services to children identified in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (1)(A).

“(iii) SECRETARIAL AUTHORITY TO MODIFY DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may modify the number of vouchers specified in subclauses (I) through (III) of clause (i) to take into account the availability of appropriations and the need to ensure that the vouchers distributed by the entity are for amounts that are adequate to ensure the provision of mentoring services for a 12-month period.

“(C) COLLABORATION AND COOPERATION.—A description of how the entity will ensure collaboration and cooperation with other interested parties, including courts and prisons, with respect to the delivery of mentoring services under the demonstration project.

“(D) OTHER.—Any other information that the Secretary may find necessary to demonstrate the capacity of the entity to satisfy the requirements of this subsection.

“(4) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT REQUIREMENTS.—A cooperative agreement awarded under this subsection shall require the eligible entity to do the following:

“(A) IDENTIFY QUALITY STANDARDS FOR PROVIDERS.—
To work with the Secretary to identify the quality standards that a provider of mentoring services must meet in order to participate in the demonstration project and which, at a minimum, shall include criminal records checks for individuals who are prospective mentors and shall prohibit approving any individual to be a mentor if the criminal records check of the individual reveals a conviction which would prevent the individual from being approved as a foster or adoptive parent under section 471(a)(20)(A). I
ε

“(B) IDENTIFY ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS.—To identify and compile a list of those providers of mentoring services in any of the 50 States or the District of Columbia that meet the quality standards identified pursuant to subparagraph (A). I

“(C) IDENTIFY ELIGIBLE CHILDREN.—To identify children of prisoners who require mentoring services, consistent with the priorities specified in paragraph (1)(A).

“(D) MONITOR AND OVERSEE DELIVERY OF MENTORING SERVICES.—To satisfy specific requirements of the Secretary for monitoring and overseeing the delivery of mentoring

services under the demonstration project, which shall include a requirement to ensure that providers of mentoring services under the project report data on the children served and the types of mentoring services provided.

“(E) RECORDS, REPORTS, AND AUDITS.—To maintain any records, make any reports, and cooperate with any reviews and audits that the Secretary determines are necessary to oversee the activities of the entity in carrying out the demonstration project under this subsection.

“(F) EVALUATIONS.—To cooperate fully with any evaluations of the demonstration project, including collecting and monitoring data and providing the Secretary or the Secretary’s designee with access to records and staff related to the conduct of the project.

“(G) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES.—To ensure that administrative expenditures incurred by the entity in conducting the demonstration project with respect to a fiscal year do not exceed the amount equal to 10 percent of the amount awarded to carry out the project for that year.

“(5) VOUCHER REQUIREMENTS.—A voucher for mentoring services provided to the family of a child identified in accordance with paragraph (1)(A) shall meet the following requirements:

“(A) TOTAL PAYMENT AMOUNT; 12-MONTH SERVICE PERIOD.—The voucher shall specify the total amount to be paid a provider of mentoring services for providing the child on whose behalf the voucher is issued with mentoring services for a 12-month period.

“(B) PERIODIC PAYMENTS AS SERVICES PROVIDED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The voucher shall specify that it may be redeemed with the eligible entity by the provider accepting the voucher in return for agreeing to provide mentoring services for the child on whose behalf the voucher is issued.

“(ii) DEMONSTRATION OF THE PROVISION OF SERVICES.—A provider that redeems a voucher issued by the eligible entity shall receive periodic payments from the eligible entity during the 12-month period that the voucher is in effect upon demonstration of the provision of significant services and activities related to the provision of mentoring services to the child on whose behalf the voucher is issued.

“(6) PROVIDER REQUIREMENTS.—In order to participate in the demonstration project, a provider of mentoring services shall—

“(A) meet the quality standards identified by the eligible entity in accordance with paragraph (1);

“(B) agree to accept a voucher meeting the requirements of paragraph (5) as payment for the provision of mentoring services to a child on whose behalf the voucher is issued;

“(C) demonstrate that the provider has the capacity, and has or will have nonfederal resources, to continue supporting the provision of mentoring services to the child on whose behalf the voucher is issued, as appropriate,

after the conclusion of the 12-month period during which the voucher is in effect; and

“(D) if the provider is a recipient of a grant under this section, demonstrate that the provider has exhausted its capacity for providing mentoring services under the grant.

“(7) 3-YEAR PERIOD; OPTION FOR RENEWAL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A cooperative agreement awarded under this subsection shall be effective for a 3-year period.

“(B) RENEWAL.—The cooperative agreement may be renewed for an additional period, not to exceed 2 years and subject to any conditions that the Secretary may specify that are not inconsistent with the requirements of this subsection or subsection (i)(2)(B), if the Secretary determines that the entity has satisfied the requirements of the agreement and evaluations of the service delivery demonstration project demonstrate that the voucher service delivery method is effective in providing mentoring services to children of prisoners.

“(8) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION AND REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into a contract with an independent, private organization to evaluate and prepare a report on the first 2 fiscal years in which the demonstration project is conducted under this subsection. Cont

“(B) DEADLINE FOR REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the end of the second fiscal year in which the demonstration project is conducted under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit the report required under subparagraph (A) to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate. The report shall include—

“(i) the number of children as of the end of such second fiscal year who received vouchers for mentoring services; and

“(ii) any conclusions regarding the use of vouchers for the delivery of mentoring services for children of prisoners.

“(9) NO EFFECT ON ELIGIBILITY FOR OTHER FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.—A voucher provided to a family under the demonstration project conducted under this subsection shall be disregarded for purposes of determining the eligibility for, or the amount of any other Federal or federally-supported assistance for the family.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 439 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 629i), as amended by subsection (a) of this section and paragraph (1) of this subsection, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “PURPOSE” and inserting “PURPOSES”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in the paragraph heading, by striking “PURPOSE” and inserting “PURPOSES”; and

(II) by striking “The purpose of this section is to authorize the Secretary to make competitive” and inserting “The purposes of this section are to authorize the Secretary—

“(A) to make competitive”;

(iii) by striking the period at the end and inserting
“; and”; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) to enter into on a competitive basis a cooperative agreement to conduct a service delivery demonstration project in accordance with the requirements of subsection (g).”;

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking “(h)” and inserting “(i)”; and

(ii) by striking “(h)(2)” and inserting “(i)(2)”;

(C) by amending subsection (h) (as so redesignated by paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection) to read as follows:

“(h) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION; REPORTS.—

“(1) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall conduct by grant, contract, or cooperative agreement an independent evaluation of the programs authorized under this section, including the service delivery demonstration project authorized under subsection (g).

“(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress that includes the following:

“(A) The characteristics of the mentoring programs funded under this section.

“(B) The plan for implementation of the service delivery demonstration project authorized under subsection (g).

“(C) A description of the outcome-based evaluation of the programs authorized under this section that the Secretary is conducting as of that date of enactment and how the evaluation has been expanded to include an evaluation of the demonstration project authorized under subsection (g).

“(D) The date on which the Secretary shall submit a final report on the evaluation to the Congress.”; and

(D) in subsection (i) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “RESERVATION” and inserting “RESERVATIONS”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by amending the paragraph heading to read as follows: “RESERVATIONS”;

(II) by striking “The” and inserting the following:

“(A) RESEARCH, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND EVALUATION.—The”; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) SERVICE DELIVERY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), for purposes of awarding a cooperative agreement to conduct the service delivery demonstration project authorized under subsection (g), the Secretary shall reserve not more than—

“(I) \$5,000,000 of the amount appropriated under paragraph (1) for the first fiscal year in which funds are to be awarded for the agreement;

“(II) \$10,000,000 of the amount appropriated under paragraph (1) for the second fiscal year in

which funds are to be awarded for the agreement;
and

“(III) \$15,000,000 of the amount appropriated under paragraph (1) for the third fiscal year in which funds are to be awarded for the agreement.

“(ii) ASSURANCE OF FUNDING FOR GENERAL PROGRAM GRANTS.—With respect to any fiscal year, no funds may be awarded for a cooperative agreement under subsection (g), unless at least \$25,000,000 of the amount appropriated under paragraph (1) for that fiscal year is used by the Secretary for making grants under this section for that fiscal year.”.

SEC. 9. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE COURT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

Section 438 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629h) is amended in each of subsections (c)(1)(A) and (d) by striking “2006” and inserting “2011”.