

## THE SUPPORTING STATEMENT

### General Instructions

**A. Supporting Statement, including the text of the notice to the public required by 5 CFR 1320.5(a)(i)(iv) and its actual or estimated date of publication in the Federal Register, must accompany each request for approval of a collection of information. The Supporting Statement must be prepared in the format described below, and must contain the information specified in Section A below. If an item is not applicable, provide a brief explanation. When Item 17 of the OMB Form 83-I is checked "Yes," Section B of the Supporting Statement must be completed. OMB reserves the right to require the submission of additional information with respect to any request for approval.**

### Specific Instructions

**A. Justification. Requests for approval shall:**

- 1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection.**

**Attach a copy of the appropriate section of each statute and regulation mandating or authorizing the collection of information.**

The Promoting Safe and Stable Families Amendments, as reauthorized (2006), amended Title IV-B of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629-629e), provides funding for nonprofit agencies that recruit, screen, train, and support mentors for children with an incarcerated parent or parents. The Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB) of the Administration for Children and Families, United States Department of Health and Human Services, administers the Mentoring Children of Prisoners (MCP) program. The MCP program provides children of prisoners with caring adult mentors by supporting one-to-one mentoring relationships. Research in other populations has shown that such relationships can lead to reductions in risk behaviors and improvements in academic, behavioral, and psychological outcomes. Although the MCP program was developed based on research documenting the efficacy of mentoring as a general intervention strategy, it is not yet known whether or not this particular intervention yields positive outcomes for children of prisoners. Little is known about how mentoring relationships work for these youth, and how effective mentoring relationships for children of prisoners differ from effective mentoring relationships for other youth. In addition, little is known about children of prisoners in general and thus a survey of MCP program youth has the potential to provide important data about this relatively unstudied population.

The evaluation and data collection proposed in this notice are to fulfill the statutory requirement under Section 8, subsection h (1) of the Child and

Family Services Improvement Act of 2006, as amended, that the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services evaluate outcomes of the MCP program and report to Congress on the findings.

**2. Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used. Except for a new collection, indicate the actual use the agency has made of the information received from the current collection.**

The proposed data collections will support a study of the MCP program that measures the outcomes of participating youth and compares them to outcomes for youth in the control group of another study of mentored youth. The data collection also will provide general information about youth in the program, and will help FYSB to understand the MCP program's potential to reduce risk behaviors relative to the experiences of similar youth. The study will also include an administrative survey of grantees participating in the study.

Baseline and follow-up survey data will be used to make comparisons between MCP program youth and other youth on outcomes that the MCP program aims to improve. The baseline data will be used to gauge the extent to which the sample of MCP youth resemble other youth on a variety demographic characteristics, behaviors, and attitudes. The baseline survey will be administered to 625 program youth. Follow-up data will be used to estimate how MCP program youths' outcomes changed relative to youth not in the program. The study team will aim to attain follow-up data from at least 80 percent of the baseline sample, or 500 youth. Data for the comparison sample of youth will be obtained from another evaluation, and is not part of this proposed data collection activity.

The evaluators will survey 72 grantees to obtain a detailed understanding of program operations, and to learn if/how sites included in the quasi-experimental study differ from the universe of grantees. The administrative survey of grantees will include questions about program operations, including program structure, staffing, and strategies for recruiting and supporting mentors and youth.

**3. Describe whether, and to what extent the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g. permitting electronic submission of responses, and the basis for the decision for adopting this means of collection. Also describe any consideration of using information technology to reduce burden.**

To reduce burden to MCP grantees, the administrative survey will be administered electronically. This decision was made in response to feedback from grantees who recommended and were in favor of using online surveys. The study team will develop a secure, password protected online survey and provide respondents with a link to the site and login information. Paper surveys will be available for those who do not have the capacity to complete an online survey and will be mailed upon request.

- 4. Describe efforts to identify duplication. Show specifically why any similar information already available cannot be used or modified for use for the purposes described in Item 2 above.**

Efforts to avoid duplication include a review of FYSB's administrative agency reporting requirements and of existing studies of FYSB programs. No data are currently being collected to answer the research questions about MCP programs. Data collected quarterly from program sites about program operations will be used to obtain demographic information. Existing data can and will be used whenever possible.

- 5. If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small entities (Item 5 of OMB Form 83-I), describe any methods used to minimize burden.**

The information being requested has been held to the absolute minimum required for the intended use.

- 6. Describe the consequence to Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently, as well as any technical or legal obstacles to reduce burden.**

This submission is for a one-time baseline and a one-time follow-up data collection necessary to describe the characteristics of MCP program participants and changes in their outcomes, and for a one-time administrative survey of MCP grantees. Without these data, FYSB will be unable to analyze the potential effects of the program.

- 7. Explain any special circumstances that require the collection to be conducted in a manner:**
  - o requiring respondents to report information to the agency more often than quarterly;**
  - o requiring respondents to prepare a written response to a collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it;**
  - o requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document;**
  - o requiring respondents to retain records, other than health, medical, government contract, grant-in-aid, or tax records for more than three years;**
  - o in connection with a statistical survey, that is not designed to produce valid and reliable results that can be generalized to the universe of study;**

- o requiring the use of a statistical data classification that has not been reviewed and approved by OMB;
- o that includes a pledge of confidentiality that is not supported by authority established in statute or regulation, that is not supported by disclosure and data security policies that are consistent with the pledge, or which unnecessarily impedes sharing of data with other agencies for compatible confidential use; or
- o requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secret, or other confidential information unless the agency can demonstrate that it has instituted procedures to protect the information's confidentiality to the extent permitted by law.

The evaluation will not include MCP programs whose grants are scheduled to expire prior to Fiscal Year 2009, as these sites will no longer be receiving MCP funding during the follow-up survey period. In addition, the quasi-experimental study is designed to estimate the potential impacts of MCP programs that have been fully implemented. The study will exclude programs with low youth enrollment and programs without the capacity to administer the baseline survey. However, these sites will be included in the administrative survey of grantees.

8. If applicable, provide a copy and identify the date and page number of publication in the Federal Register of the agency's notice, required by 5 CFR 1320.8 (d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Specifically address comments received on cost and hour burden.

Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.

Consultation with representatives of those from whom information is to be obtained or those who must compile records, should occur at least once every 3 years - even if the collection of information activity is the same as in prior periods. There may be circumstances that mitigate against consultation in a specific situation. These circumstances should be explained.

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub.L. No. 104-13) and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) regulations at 5 CFR Part 1320 (60 FR

44978, August 29, 1995), HHS/FYSB published a notice in the Federal Register announcing the agency's intention to request an OMB review of data collection activities. The notice was published on December 13, 2006 on page 74923-74924 and provided a 60-day period for public comment. A copy of the Federal Register notice for this information collection is included in Appendix A.

Members of the public had comments as well as questions. Some were concerned about the younger youth understanding the survey items, but these items have been successfully used in the past with children as young as nine years old. In addition, to address the issue of youth who may not be able to read the survey independently, the survey administrator will read the survey and response options aloud while youth mark their own responses. The question of honesty and socially desirable answers was also raised. While it is certainly true that youth may not answer honestly on any survey of a sensitive nature, the evaluators have addressed this issue by having youth seal their questionnaires in an envelope before handing them to program staff, and by assuring youth that their responses will be kept private.

The surveys were developed by an HHS/FYSB contractor, Abt Associates Inc. Dr. Jean Rhodes, Professor of Psychology at the University of Massachusetts, Boston advised on overall study design and instrumentation, and will advise on evaluation implementation, analysis, and reporting. Carla Herrera of Public/Private Ventures and an evaluator from Big Brothers Big Sisters of America provided feedback on instrument development and survey administration.

The baseline and follow-up surveys are comprised predominantly of items that have been tested with and administered to youth similar to those who will be included in the study sample (including youth as young as nine years old), and the evaluators received feedback about the survey length and content from program practitioners and experts in the mentoring and evaluation fields. In addition, Abt Associates Inc. tested the baseline survey with one youth enrolled in a mentoring program serving at-risk youth.

The administrative survey of grantees was mailed to nine MCP program staff members. Grantees were asked to complete the survey and return it to Abt Associates Inc. by mail or fax. Abt Associates staff followed up with the six grantees who returned completed surveys to discuss the process and particular survey items.

**9. Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.**

No payments or gifts will be given to respondents of the baseline survey or to grantees who complete the administrative survey. A monetary gift (\$15) will be provided to youth upon collection of contact information for administration of the follow-up survey, and they will be offered \$20 for completing the follow-up survey. In the event that the follow-up survey needs to be administered in person (using a cell phone to replicate the conditions for all other follow-up surveys), parents/guardians will be offered \$25 to ensure that their child is available/home for the follow-up survey. These youth are part of a hard-to-reach population who often are very mobile; therefore, incentives

are provided for the follow-up survey in order to retain as many youth as possible and improve the quality of the data collected.

**10. Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents and the basis for the assurance in statute, regulation, or agency policy.**

Every effort will be made to protect the privacy and/or confidentiality of respondents. The confidentiality procedures adopted for this study during all rounds of data collection, data processing, and analysis consist of the following:

- All study respondents will be assured that the information they provide is confidential and will be used only for the purpose of this research. Respondents will place and seal their completed surveys in a return addressed and stamped envelope, and program staff will not see responses. To ensure data security, all individuals hired by our contractor, Abt Associates Inc., are required to adhere to strict standards and sign an oath of confidentiality as a condition of employment.
- Hard-copy data collection forms are delivered to a locked area for receipt and processing. Abt Associates Inc. maintains restricted access to all data preparation areas (i.e., receipt, coding, and 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 individual grantee staff, service providers, program participants, or comparison group members.
- Abt Associates Inc. is in the process of obtaining a Certificate of Confidentiality from NIH/NIAAA.

**11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private. This justification should include the reasons why the agency considers the questions necessary, the specific uses to be made of the information, the explanation to be given to persons from whom the information is requested, and any steps to be taken to obtain their consent.**

The intent of this evaluation is to measure the potential impact of MCP programs on at-risk youth. The desired outcomes of these programs are to reduce or prevent high-risk behaviors among participating children. Because high-risk behaviors are often potentially sensitive subjects, some questions will be sensitive for the respondents. Youth will be asked about their

attitudes toward, or participation in, a number of activities, including substance use, misbehavior, and about self-perception. Questions included in the surveys have been adapted from other measures and have been tested with similar target populations.

This information is not available from other sources. To protect respondents from discomfort, respondents will be informed that they may skip any question they wish not to answer, and they may cease participating in the study at any point. Finally, security measures and commitment to ensuring the confidentiality of the data (see previous section) minimize the encumbrance to respondents of providing this information.

**12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information. The statements should:**

**o Indicate the number of respondents, frequency of the response, annual hour burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated. Unless directed to do so, agencies should not conduct special surveys to obtain information on which to base hour burden estimates. Consultation with a sample (fewer than 10) of potential respondents is desirable. If the hour burden on respondents is expected to vary widely because of differences in activity, size, or complexity, show the range of estimated hour burden, and explain the reasons for the variance. Generally, estimates should not include burden hours for customary and usual business practices.**

**o If this request for approval covers more than one form, provide separate hour burden estimates for each form and aggregate the hour burdens in Item 13 of OMB Form 83-I.**

**o Provide estimates of annualized cost to the respondents (other than individuals and households) for hour burdens for collection of information identifying and using appropriate wage rate categories. The cost of contracting out or paying outside parties for information collection activities should not be included here. Instead, this cost should be included in Item 14.**

**ANNUAL BURDEN ESTIMATES**

<b>INSTRUMENT</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS</b>	<b>NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER RESPONDENT</b>	<b>AVERAGE BURDEN HOURS PER RESPONSE</b>	<b>TOTAL BURDEN HOURS</b>
Youth Baseline Survey	625	1	.5	312.5

Youth Follow-up Survey	500	1	.5	250
Grantee Survey	223	1	1	223

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 785.5

The burden estimates are based both on pretests of the survey instruments, as well as experience with similar data collection efforts for other studies.

**13. Provide an estimate of the annual cost burden to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information. (Do not include the cost of any hour burden shown in Items #12 and 14)**

o The cost estimate should be split into two components: (a) a total capital and start-up cost component (annualized over its expected useful life); and (b) a total operation and maintenance and purchase of services component. The estimates should take into account costs associated with generating, maintaining, and disclosing or providing the information. Include descriptions of methods used to estimate major cost factors including system and technology acquisition, expected useful life of capital equipment, the discount rates(s), and the time period over which costs will be incurred. Capital and start-up costs include, among other items, preparations for collection information such as purchasing computers and software; monitoring, sampling, drilling and testing equipment; and record storage facilities.

o If cost estimates are expected to vary widely, agencies should present ranges of cost burdens and explain the reasons for the variance. The cost of purchasing or contracting out information collection services should be a part of this cost burden estimate. In developing cost burden estimates, agencies may consult with a sample of respondents (fewer than 10), utilize the 60-day pre-OMB submission public comment process and use existing economic or regulatory impact analysis associated with the rulemaking containing the information collection, as appropriate.

o Generally, estimates should not include purchases of equipment, or services made: (1) prior to October 1, 1995, (2) to achieve regulatory compliance with requirements not associated with the information collection, or (3) for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the government.



There are no annualized capital/startup or ongoing operation and maintenance costs associated with collecting this information. There are no direct respondent costs associated with this data collection other than opportunity costs of respondents' time required to complete the surveys. The evaluation does not place any capital equipment, start-up, or record maintenance requirements on respondents.

- 14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal Government. Also, provide a description of the method used to estimate cost, which should include quantification of hours, operational expenses (such as equipment, overhead, printing, and support staff), and any other expense that would not have been incurred without this collection of information. Agencies also may aggregate cost estimates from 12, 13, and 14 in a single table.**

The estimated cost to the Federal Government for the Evaluation of Mentoring Children of Prisoners Program is \$625,709, with an annual cost of \$156,427.25. The total amount includes: \$85,494 for development of the study design, instruments, and justification package, \$337,471 for data collection, and \$184,916 for data analysis and reporting.

- 15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reported in Items 13 or 14 of the OMB Form 83-I.**

This request is for a new information collection.

- 16. For collections of information whose results are planned to be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication. Address any complex analytical techniques that will be used. Provide the time schedule for the entire project, including beginning and ending dates of the collection of information, completion of report, publication dates and other actions.**

Abt Associates Inc. will present analyses and findings to FYSB in a series of memorandums and reports; publication dates will be determined at FYSB's discretion. Baseline analyses will be conducted in January 2008, following the conclusion of the baseline survey administration period (September - December 2007). To determine how the potential for risk behavior among children of prisoners compares to the potential for risk behavior among a group of youth not in the MCP program, the evaluators will compare the baseline characteristics of a sample of approximately 625 MCP program children with the characteristics of youth in the control group in a similar study of mentored youth, and determine if there are significant differences (comparison group data are being collected for a separate study and are not included in this information collection). T-tests will be used to make statistical comparisons between the two samples of youth. The evaluators will deliver an interim report that includes baseline analyses to FYSB in March 2008.

The approach to measuring improvement on outcomes rests on the assumption that MCP participants' outcomes would remain constant or deteriorate, *relative to*

*the other sample*, absent any intervention. Thus, differences in outcomes that arise between MCP participants and the comparison sample are potentially attributable to the intervention. Depending on the direction of the relative change, we will observe whether MCP participants' outcomes are getting better or worse, relative to the comparison sample. For example, if the difference in outcomes between the MCP sample and the comparison sample is smaller at follow-up than at baseline, then this would indicate that the MCP program may have positive effects on youth outcomes. Following the follow-up survey administration (which will be conducted September - December 2008) analyses will be performed to measure the differences in MCP participant outcomes observed approximately 12 months after baseline from outcomes measured for other populations of the same age distribution. (The final report will not be authored until April 2009.) The same formula for assessing statistical differences used at baseline will be employed for follow-up analyses.

The final evaluation report will be delivered to FYSB in April 2009.

- 17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons that display would be inappropriate.**

All data collection instruments will include the expiration date for OMB approval.

- 18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19, "Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions," on Form OMB 83-I.**

No exceptions are requested.

## **B. Collections of Information Employing Statistical Methods**

The agency should be prepared to justify its decision not to use statistical methods in any case where such methods might reduce burden or improve accuracy of results. When item 16 is checked "Yes," the following documentation should be included in the supporting statement to the extent that it applies to the methods proposed:

- 1. Describe (including numerical estimate) the potential respondent universe and any sampling or other respondent selection method to be used. Data on the number of entities (e.g., establishments, State and local government units, households or persons) in the universe covered by the collection and in the corresponding sample are to be provided in tabular form for the universe as a whole and for each of the strata in the proposed sample. Indicate expected response rates for the collection as a whole. If the collection had been conducted previously, include the actual response rate achieved during the last collection.**

Respondents	Universe	Sample
MCP Participant Youth	19,576	625
MCP Grantees	282	72

At least 20 grantees that will continue to receive MCP funding through Fiscal Year 2009 will be asked to administer the baseline survey to at least five youth during enrollment in the program beginning in September 2007 in order to reach a sample size of 625 youth (for a total of 1250 including the comparison sample). The expected response rate for the follow-up youth survey is 80%, or 500 youth (for a total of 1000 including the comparison sample).

Determining the number of study participants and grantees involved balancing statistical precision against cost. The numbers of participants must be sufficient to detect meaningful effects for the MCP Program; however, costs increase as sample size increases. Based on guidance provided by the 1995 evaluation of mentoring programs conducted by Public/Private Ventures, the evaluators have proposed a sample size of 1,250 (625 each in the treatment and comparison groups). Assuming a response rate of 80 percent for the follow-up survey, the resulting analysis sample of 1,000 would allow the study team to detect a standardized effect size on a dichotomous outcome of approximately .1, or a 5 percentage point difference or less in the incidence of a given outcome.

## 2. Describe the procedures for the collection of information

From September to November 2007, the research team will facilitate the administration of the baseline survey to 625 youth in MCP programs, just before those youth are matched with mentors. The survey will provide contact and background information for youth in the quasi-experimental study and also will supply pre-program measures of targeted outcomes for these youth.

Before completing baseline surveys, participating youth and their parents or guardians will be asked to sign forms indicating their willingness to participate in the study and to complete baseline and follow-up surveys (see Appendix B).<sup>1</sup> **Abt Associates developed these forms, but to reduce study costs, will rely on MCP program staff to obtain signed parent/guardian permission forms for youth in the study.** To facilitate this process, programs will obtain this permission as they enroll youth in the program. MCP program staff also will provide the evaluation team with contact information for all youth in the study at this time.

The research team created the instrument, and will monitor completion and compile individual surveys in an electronic database. To reduce the cost of administration, MCP program staff will administer this survey on-site. The

<sup>1</sup> The forms will explain the purpose of the study. It also will authorize the evaluators to obtain relevant administrative records about study participants.

research team will train site staff in how to administer it (to ensure uniform administration and universal completion). Youth will seal completed questionnaires in envelopes before returning them to program staff. Program staff will mail the envelopes to Abt Associates Inc., which will pay for postage.

Abt Associates will survey all grantees. The survey will include questions about program operations, including program structure, staffing, and strategies for recruiting and supporting mentors and youth. It also may probe for information about other topics of particular interest to FYSB and the mentoring research community. The survey will be administered electronically on a secure, password protected website. The link to the survey will be emailed to grantees.

Abt Associates' subcontractor, Moore & Associates, will conduct follow-up surveys of the 625 youth in the study sample approximately 12 months after the baseline survey. The follow-up surveys will: measure the same outcomes measured at baseline; ask mentored youth about their experiences in the MCP program; and update household-related information. The follow-up survey will achieve a response rate of at least 80 percent (for a total follow-up survey sample of at least 500). Interviews will be completed by telephone, with provision for field follow-up to attain the target response rate.

#### . **Statistical methodology for stratification and sample selection**

The quasi-experimental study will include at least 20 MCP sites. Youth enrolling in the programs at these sites during the study period will be included in the sample. We will select these sites based on data from MCP Program quarterly reports and grant applications, and consider the following factors:

- Each site should have a demonstrated track record for effectively recruiting youth and matching them with mentors within a two to three month time period,
- Each site must be able to recruit and match youth with mentors during the baseline period (between September and November 2007), and
- Each site is willing and able to participate in the quasi-experimental study.

#### . **Estimation procedure**

At baseline, the evaluation team will use a t-test to compare characteristics of MCP youth to characteristics of the comparison sample. The same approach will be used at follow up to estimate differences between the two samples in changes for outcomes.

The approach to measuring improvement on outcomes rests on the assumption that MCP participants' outcomes would remain constant or deteriorate, **relative to the comparison sample**, absent any intervention. We discuss relative improvements because some of the outcomes of interest (incidence of reported risk behaviors) are likely to increase with age as a normal part of development. Thus, differences in outcomes that arise between MCP participants and the comparison sample are potentially attributable to the

intervention. The direction of the relative change will indicate whether MCP participants are getting better or worse, relative to other populations.

The evaluation team will measure the differences in MCP participant outcomes observed approximately 12 months after baseline from outcomes measured for other populations of the same age distribution. The formula for assessing statistical differences is the same as that used at baseline. The evaluation team will then compare differences at follow-up with differences at baseline to assess whether MCP participants improve relative to the comparison sample.

- . **Degree of accuracy needed for the purpose described in the justification**

Not applicable.

- . **Unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures**

There are no unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures.

- . **Any use of periodic (less frequent than annual) data collection cycles to reduce burden.**

Not applicable.

- 3. Describe methods to maximize response rates and to deal with issues of nonresponse. The accuracy and reliability of information collected must be shown to be adequate for intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided for any collection that will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the universe studied.**

The baseline survey of youth will be administered by MCP grantees as youth enroll in the programs. During the site recruitment effort, Abt Associates Inc. will obtain information from grantees about their intake process in order to maximize the efficiency and efficacy of the survey administration.

Moore & Associates, Inc. will conduct follow-up surveys of the 625 youth in the study sample approximately 12 months after the baseline survey. The follow-up survey will achieve a response rate of at least 80 percent (for a total follow-up survey sample of at least 500). Interviews will be completed by telephone, with provision for field follow-up if necessary to attain the target response rate. A small monetary gift (\$15) will be provided to youth upon collection of contact information for administration of the follow-up survey, and youth will be offered \$20 for completing the follow-up survey. If in-person follow-up is necessary, parents/guardians will be offered a \$25 incentive to make sure that their children are home/available to complete the follow-up survey.

- 4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to be undertaken.**

**Testing is encouraged as an effective means of refining collections of information to minimize burden and improve utility. Tests must be approved if they call for collection of identical information from 10 or more respondents. A proposed test or set of tests may be submitted for approval separately or in combination with the main collection of information.**

The baseline and follow-up surveys are comprised predominantly of items that have been tested with youth similar to those who will be included in the study sample, and the evaluators received feedback about the survey length and content from program practitioners and experts in the mentoring and evaluation fields. In addition, Abt Associates Inc. tested the baseline survey with one youth enrolled in a mentoring program serving at-risk youth.

The administrative survey of grantees was mailed to nine MCP program staff members. Grantees were asked to complete the survey and return it to Abt Associates Inc. by mail or fax. Abt Associates staff followed up with the six grantees who returned completed surveys to discuss the process and particular survey items.

- 5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on statistical aspects of the design and the name of the agency unit, contractor(s), grantee(s), or other person(s) who will actually collect and/or analyze the information for the agency.**

Family and Youth Services Bureau: (202) 205-8496  
Stan Chappell

Abt Associates Inc.: (617) 492-7100  
Catherine Dun Rappaport, Principal Investigator