Supporting Statement for Request for Clearance

THE ROLE OF FAITH-BASED AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS IN POST-HURRICANE HUMAN SERVICES RELIEF EFFORTS

June 14, 2007

Submitted to:

Department of Health and Human Services

Office of the Chief Information Officer
Office of Resources Management
200 Independence Avenue, S.W. 537-H
Washington, DC 20201

Submitted by:

The Urban Institute
2100 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037

Table of Contents

June 14, 2007

Supporting Statement for "The Role of Faith-based and Community Organizations in Post-Hurricane Human Services Relief Efforts"

By many accounts, faith-based and community organizations (FBCOs) have been a critical component of the post-Katrina relief and recovery efforts in the Gulf Coast region. However systematic information on their level of effort, types of services, networks used to provide services, or relationships with government agencies, is very sparse. This request for review and approval by the Office of Budget and Management under the Paperwork Reduction Act is to conduct a one-time data collection effort, anticipated to take place in 2007, by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) at U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The proposed study on the role of faith-based and community organizations in post-hurricane human services relief efforts will survey by telephone a random sample of FBCOs in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Houston to measure the number and types of activities that were conducted and the types of networks used to provide relief services in the aftermath of hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005. The study will also undertake field-based case studies of a small number of FBCOs to assess in-depth their experiences, successes and challenges in serving hurricane victims, particularly those with low incomes, limited mobility, and few resources to reestablish their lives. The study will produce reports and other materials for use by a broad audience, but especially for HHS officials to develop strategies to work with FBCOs during and after disasters and other emergencies.

A. Justification

A1. Need and Legal Basis

The aftermath of hurricanes Katrina and Rita demonstrated that faith-based and community organizations played a vital role in the relief and recovery efforts and that formal response agencies such as the Red Cross and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) were not well prepared to work with these providers. Little is known about how FBCOs operate during and after disasters, the funding and resources they use, the staff and volunteers that make up the manpower, the services they provide, and the networks and partnerships with other organizations, congregations, business, and government. Having a better understanding of these factors will assist government in its efforts to provide services after a large disaster and to better coordinate and partner with these locally based organizations. The authorizing legislation for this data collection is 42USC301, the Public Health Service Act.

In response to this need, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' (HHS) Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) developed a framework for understanding the role of FBCOs in disaster relief, especially how it pertains to human services. The study addresses the following questions to learn more about the Gulf Coast experience:

1. What are the characteristics of FBCOs that provided disaster-related human services?
2. What types of services were provided and to whom?

3. What types of networks facilitated the ability of FBCOs to deliver services?
4. What lessons can be learned from these relief efforts?

With these questions guiding the data collection process, ASPE through its contractor, the Urban Institute, will implement a survey of 200 FBCOs and 8-10 case studies of FBCOs and their networks in Louisiana and Mississippi and Houston, Texas. The lessons learned from this study will assist the federal government in reviewing its emergency preparedness strategies and developing mechanisms for working with FBCOs in the future. The research conducted through this project will support the President's Faith-based Initiative, which encourages partnerships with faith-based and community organizations in providing social services to the nation's vulnerable populations.

A2. Information Users

All materials developed from the analyses of this data collection effort are intended to reach multiple audiences—HHS staff, policymakers at the state and federal levels of government, faith-based and community service providers, academic researchers, and others interested in understanding lessons learned from the Gulf Coast hurricane relief/recovery efforts. The purpose of these materials is to better inform those who plan for disasters and other emergencies as to how they can network and partner with FBCOs and what network models may best address the human services relief needs of local areas facing a crisis situation. The reports will be written in a non-technical style, and statistical information will be presented in easy-to-read graphics and tables. The materials (reports on the findings from the survey and the case studies, and up to three policy briefs) will be posted on the Internet and issued by the contractor to ensure wide distribution of the findings.

Interest in this research is broad but direct users of the information may include:

- U.S. Public Health Service
- HHS Office of Faith-based and Community Initiatives
- HHS Office of Preparedness and Response
- HHS Administration for Children and Families
- HHS Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation
- DHS Federal Emergency Management Agency
- State and local emergency relief agencies
- National and local faith-based and community organizations engaged in disaster relief efforts

The data collected and analyzed through this study will be used by public agencies to develop new strategies for working with FBCOs during and after disasters to deliver human services relief, and will assist FBCOs to work more effectively with government. Without this information, these public and private agencies will not have the necessary information on how FBCOs operate and connect with one another during a disaster to create closer and more effective delivery of emergency relief systems between government and FBCOs.

A3. Improved Information Technology

The FBCO telephone survey will be implemented through a computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) system. This method for fielding the telephone survey is considered the most appropriate choice to reach the intended audience and minimize the burden on respondents. In addition, we have reduced the burden on the respondent by asking only the minimum number of questions to answer the research questions. Questions have been designed so respondents will not need to reference outside resources that would take additional time, and skip patterns will be used through the CATI technology to move the respondent through the questions with efficiency.

We will not use any improved or advanced technology for the case studies, as it is not appropriate for the face-to-face discussions that will be held to obtain detailed perspectives from FBCOs, partner organizations/affiliates, and hurricane victims.

A4. Duplication of Similar Information

A number of steps were taken to ensure that this study would not duplicate other data collection efforts underway or planned. Through literature reviews, conferences, and consultations with community leaders in the Gulf Coast region, we were unable to identify research that was addressing the networks and service delivery activities used by FBCOs to provide relief and recovery assistance after hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

In particular, in 2006-2007, the Urban Institute co-sponsored three major conferences with policy experts, practitioners, and policymakers to discuss the challenges to the Gulf region. The first conference, held in Baton Rouge in May 2006, focused on vulnerable individuals, families, and communities. A second conference, jointly sponsored by the Urban Institute and the Louisiana Association of Nonprofit Organizations (LANO), held in New Orleans in November 2006, addressed the future of the nonprofit sector and its role in rebuilding the region. A third conference, held in Washington D.C. in March 2007, brought together representatives from the Louisiana nonprofit community and members of the national policymaking community to discuss policy options for continued disaster relief and the role of FBCOs in this shared effort. The discussions and networks that emanated from these conferences helped to confirm the unique nature of this study.

A new study at Harvard University’s Medical School is likely to complement and supplement some of the findings of this study. Known as the Hurricane Katrina Community Advisory Group, the Advisory Group consists of a representative sample of 2,000 individuals who were affected by the hurricane. Members of the Advisory Group will be interviewed quarterly to monitor their physical, emotional, and socioeconomic needs over time. The study, which focuses largely on mental health issues, contains a small number of questions regarding social support networks, the use of public and private service agencies, including FBCOs, for various types of assistance, and the extent to which the individual regards him or herself as religious or spiritual. Data collection for this longitudinal study began in January 2006. As the findings of the Advisory Group become available, they will help provide contextual background for the organizational-level and focus group data that will be collected in this study. In particular, the

Advisory Group findings are likely to complement and supplement the information we will collect during focus groups with individuals who received services from FBCOs. They will also provide a benchmark by which we can assess how well the services that the FBCOs provided addressed the most pressing needs of hurricane victims.

Based on this information, we have determined that there is no duplication of effort in this study.

A5. Small Businesses

The telephone survey and the case studies will contain some small FBCOs. For the telephone survey, all organizations will respond to the same questionnaire and no short form was created for this survey. However, the survey is designed to ensure that all respondents will be able to complete the telephone survey in one call of no more than 20 minutes without needing to go to outside resources for answers. Furthermore, skip patterns in the questionnaire will allow FBCOs that provided fewer services to hurricane victims to answer fewer questions. To the extent that small FBCOs were less active than larger FBCOs, they will be asked fewer questions, thereby minimizing burden.

Respondents will only be required to participate in one round of the telephone survey, and only a few organizations (8-10) will be asked to participate in the case study. The case study instruments will ask the same questions of all respondents and will take approximately 1 to 1½ hours to complete. The information requested in both the telephone survey and the case study data collection efforts has been held to an absolute minimum required to answer the research questions and minimize the burden on the respondents.

A6. Less Frequent Collection

This data collection is a one-time effort to better understand the activities of FBCOs during one time period, i.e., after hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005. This study is of a particular historical event, and we do not need to collect data more than one time.

A7. Special Circumstances

There are no special circumstances that apply to this data collection.

A8. *Federal Register* Notice/Outside Consultation

A notice was published in the Federal Register (p. 18253) on April 11, 2007, to solicit comments on the FBCO data collection prior to submission of this OMB clearance request. No public comments were received in response to this notice.

To obtain perspectives from outside the agency, we formed a technical advisory group (TAG) in winter 2007, comprised of local and regional experts and researchers knowledgeable in faith-based and community organizations and in disaster relief efforts.

Local/regional experts on the TAG are:

Roberta Avila
Executive Director
The Mississippi Coast Interfaith Disaster Task Force
Gulfport, MS
Phone: 228-868-0961
Email: ravila@cableone.net

Rev. Jennifer Jones-Bridges
Past-Executive Director
Working Interfaith Network (WIN)
Baton Rouge, LA
Phone: 225-201-0016
Email: JJALENJ@aol.com

Terry Henderson
Director
National Disaster Relief for the North American Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention Board
Alpharetta, GA
Phone: (770) 410-6000
Email: thenderson@namb.net

Kevin King
Executive Director
Mennonite Disaster Relief
Akron, PA
Phone: (717) 859-2210
Email: Kking@mds.mennonite.net

The research experts on the TAG are:

Harry Hatry
Distinguished Fellow
The Urban Institute
Washington, D.C.
Phone: 202-261-5521
Email: Hhatry@ui.urban.org

Dr. Stephen V. Monsma
Research Fellow
The Henry Institute for the Study of Christianity and Politics
Calvin College
Grand Rapids, MI
Phone: 616-526-6993
Email: sm24@calvin.edu

Dr. Demetra Nightingale

Principal Research Scientist
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, MD
Phone: 202-516-8796
Email: dnight@jhu.edu

The advisors independently reviewed the survey questionnaire and discussion guides for methodological and substantive issues. There were no major problems or comments that could not be resolved during the review of the data collection instruments. For the telephone survey questionnaire, the advisors suggested some changes in terminology to make the questions more readily understandable to respondents and the addition of several close-ended questions with mutually exclusive responses to reduce the burden on respondents as much as possible. For the discussion guides, the advisors suggested some changes in terminology, some additions and clarifications to the types of services and types of organizations that may have interacted, and minimizing organizational and budget questions so respondents could more quickly focus on describing their relief efforts. The proposed changes suggested by the TAG were made to the survey questionnaire and the discussion guides.

After the data collection is complete, the TAG will review materials developed from the analyses of the data.

A9. Payment/Gift to Respondents

Focus group participants will be provided a small remuneration of $25 to increase the participation numbers. These focus groups will be comprised of hurricane victims that received relief services during and/or after the storms from FBCOs in the study. The incentive payment will be provided at the time of the focus group after careful explanation of the procedures for the focus group. Any individual who chooses not to participate after receiving the detailed explanation will be provided the incentive payment so that the payment is not a coercion to participate.

We believe that remuneration is crucial to helping achieve an unbiased sample of clients who received relief and recovery services after the hurricanes and to attempt to reach the target response rates. The provision of such a respondent fee will help make it more convenient for individuals to make time in their schedules to participate in the focus group during the short data collection period that we are in the field. Further, some focus group participants may incur direct costs for attending the focus group, and consequently might not be able to participate without remuneration. For example, some of the hurricane victims are single parents and may need to pay for child care for the short period of time that they attend the focus group. We believe that $25 is a reasonable compensation for any inconvenience and cost associated with participation in the focus group.

Incentives have been shown to be effective in increasing overall response rates in all modes of surveys[1], and by extension in focus groups. Several empirical studies show that incentives bring

1 Singer, Eleanor. 2002. "The Use of Incentives to Reduce Nonresponse in Household Surveys." In *Survey Nonresponse,* eds. Robert M. Groves, Dan A. Dillmon, John L. Eltinge, and Roderick J.A. Little. Pp. 163-77.

into the respondent pool persons who are uninterested in the survey topic, and thus broaden the types of participants in the study.[2]

A10. Confidentiality

The HHS Privacy Act Coordinator has reviewed this data collection request and determined that the Privacy Act does not apply. However, we will take steps, as dictated by the Urban Institute Institutional Review Board (IRB) guidelines, to offer respondents the assurance that the information they provide is considered private and will not be shared with any identifiers outside of the research team. Prior to collecting data, each sample organization and focus group respondent will be provided with the pertinent privacy information, an explanation of the nature of the study, and a description of the time necessary for participating in the study. Respondents will be asked if they understand what is being asked of them and if they agree to participate under these conditions. Please see the first pages of each data collection instrument – Attachments A-D for the privacy statement to each respondent.

Respondents to the telephone survey and participants in the case studies will be knowledgeable staff or volunteers (such as executive directors, program directors, clergy, etc.) of the sampled FBCOs. In the survey questionnaire and the discussion guides, questions are designed to elicit information about the organization, not the individual respondent. We will ask respondents their name, job position, and the length of time in their position and in the organization to ascertain the respondent's probable knowledge about the services or networks used by the FBCO. (For example, we would expect that someone who has been in their position/organization for only a few weeks would be less knowledgeable about how the organization delivers its services than someone who has been in their position/organization for several years.) No other personal information will be asked of the respondent. During the analysis phase, no personal information on the respondent will be included nor reported as a part of this study.

The focus groups will consist of hurricane victims who received services from an FBCO in the case studies. During the focus group, no information identifying the participants will be asked and none will be recorded. For auditing purposes, it will be necessary for participants to sign for receipt of their incentive payment, but those records will be kept separate from project files by a designated party in a locked file, only coded identifiers will be provided to the UI accounting department, and all identifying information will be destroyed at the end of the project. We will inform individuals that their participation in the focus group is voluntary, and both the focus group conveners and the participants will be asked to respect the private nature of the process and of the responses.

The Urban Institute IRB will review the study's methods, procedures, and all data collection instruments. The Urban Institute established an IRB to make certain that its research practices and procedures effectively protect the rights and welfare of human subjects according to the requirements in Title 45, Part 46 of the Code of Federal Regulations. As a first step in our

---

2 Roberts, Paula, Chris Roberts, Bonnie Sibbald, and David Torgerson. 2000. "The Effect of a Direct Payment or a Lottery on Questionnaire Response Rates: A Randomised Controlled Trial." *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 54: 71-72.

responsibilities, we complete the Urban Institute's required Screening Form for an initial determination as to whether a project is subject to human subjects' protection. It is then determined whether or not our proposed research involves risks to human subjects and plans are developed to mitigate such risks and ensure the privacy of the individuals and families who have their information recorded in the data. The Urban Institute has developed *Guidelines for Data Security* to ensure that delivery mechanisms, access to data, computer file storage, and analyses remain secured and protected. These guidelines will also apply to the project's subcontractor, Public Policy Research Laboratory at Louisiana State University, which will collect the telephone survey data.

A11. Sensitive Questions

To distinguish faith-based from community-based organizations, respondents in the telephone survey and case studies will be asked to self-identify as faith-based. Respondents will be asked the following screening question to determine if they are eligible for the survey: "Would you describe your organization as a: (1) nonprofit organization or community-based group; (2) faith-based organization (such as a church, congregation or affiliated with a faith program); (3) government agency; or (4) something else (describe)." Respondents may indicate that their organization meets more than one of these characteristics. However, because the telephone survey is intended for faith-based and nonprofit community-based groups, we will terminate survey after this screening question if the respondent indicates that the organization is a government agency or something else.

Because the types of networks used during relief and recovery efforts may vary by the religious affiliation of an FBCO, we will ask survey respondents (if they self-identified as "faith-based") the following question: "You indicated earlier that you were faith-based. What is your congregation/organization's religious affiliation or denomination?" Case study respondents in faith-based organizations will be asked similarly to identify the religious affiliation of their organization. The frame of reference for this question will be the organization, not the individual. The respondent will not be asked to reveal his or her religious affiliation or preference. Thus, no sensitive questions of a personal nature will be asked during this data collection.

A12. Burden Estimate (Total Hours & Wages)

A12.1. Burden Hours

This submission requests OMB approval for one data collection (anticipated for 2007) on the role of FBCOs in the aftermath of hurricanes Katrina and Rita in delivering human services relief efforts. The burden for this one-time data collection is summarized below.

Burden will be created by the proposed data collection for four groups of respondents: (1) an estimated 200 directors/administrators/clergy of FBCOs in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Houston who will participate in a telephone survey; (2) approximately 30 directors or key staff of FBCOs that will be selected for the 10 case studies (three per site); (3) an estimated 60 directors or key staff of partners or affiliated organizations, including government agencies, that were part of the FBCO's service delivery network (estimated at six interviews per case study site); and (4) 60 to

100 recipients of services from the FBCOs selected for case study who will participate in the focus groups (each focus group will have 6-10 participants). In the matrix below, we have estimated burden using the upper ranges of these estimates to demonstrate a potential maximum burden.

The estimated response time for the telephone survey is based upon a pretest conducted with 7 FBCOs located in the Gulf Coast region. The range of time to complete the survey was 15 to 25 minutes. We believe that the range in time reflects the size of the FBCO as well as the extent of automated data systems. A few minor revisions were made to the survey questionnaire to limit the response time to take no more than 20 minutes, on average, to complete.

During the case study phase of the study, two types of discussion guides will be used: one guide for the directors and key staff of the FBCO selected for the case study; and another guide for the directors and key staff of partners and affiliates of the primary FBCO. These partners/affiliates may include nonprofit organizations, state and local government agencies, businesses, national affiliates, and congregations. In both of these cases, directors and key staff who are knowledgeable about the post-hurricane relief efforts will be interviewed. Based on prior experience conducting similar case studies in other research projects, we estimate that the first guide for principals in the 10 FBCOs selected for the case studies will take approximately 1½ hours. The second guide for partner organizations and affiliates will take approximately 1 hour.

The final instrument is a focus group protocol to obtain the perspectives of hurricane victims. Each focus group will have 6-10 respondents and will be held only in sites where service recipients are still located (i.e., no individuals will need to travel from an area to which they have relocated to participate. The focus group will last no more than one hour. We have estimated burden based on prior experience conducting similar focus groups in other research projects.

These instruments can be found in the following attachments: FBCO Telephone Questionnaire (Attachment A); Principal for the Case Study Discussion Guide (Attachment B); Affiliate/Other Organization Discussion Guide (Attachment C); and Focus Group Conversation Guide (Attachment D).

Type of Respondent	**Form Name**	**No. of Respondents**	**No. Responses per Responden t**	**Average Burden per Response (in hours)**	**Total Burden Hours**
Faith-based or	FBCO Telephone	200	1	20/60	67

Community Organization	Questionnaire				
Faith-based or Community Organization	Principal for the Case Study Discussion Guide	30	1	1½	45
Partner, Affiliate, or Government Organizations to the FBCO	Affiliate/Other Organization Discussion Guide	60	1	1	60
Recipients of FBCO Relief Services	Focus Group Conversation Guide	100	1	1	60
Total		**390**			**272**

A12.2. Burden Costs

Estimates of the cost to respondents for the burden of data collection are shown below. Average hourly rates were obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics website.

Type of Respondent	**Total Burden Hours**	**Median Hourly Wage Rate**	**Total Respondent Costs**
Community and Social Service Occupations* For the Questionnaire (67 hours) For the Principal Discussion Guide (45 hours) For the Affiliate/Other Discussion Guide (35 hours)	147	$15.68	$2,304.96
Government Officials** (Affiliate/Other Discussion Guide)	20	$18.72	$374.40
Management Occupations (Affiliate/Other Discussion Guide)	5	$37.32	$186.60
Individuals (Focus Group)***	100	$14.15	$1,415.00
Total	**272**		**$4,280.96**

* Inclusive of social service specialists, social workers, clergy, directors of religious activities and education, and religious workers, nationally
** Inclusive of local, state and federal officials, nationally
*** Median hourly wage for all occupations, nationally
Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, May 2005 National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates, Median Hourly Wages

A13. Capital Costs

There are no costs to respondents other than their time needed to respond.

A14. Cost to Federal Government

The estimated cost to the federal government of this data collection effort to examine the role of FBCOs in delivery of human services relief during and after hurricanes Katrina and Rita is $324,079.00, which will be borne by the HHS/ASPE.

A15. Program or Burden Changes

This is a new data collection.

A16. Publication/Tabulation Dates and Analysis Plan

This data collection effort will commence immediately after OMB approval. We request that we receive approval for a 12-month data collection period from OMB. The timetable for key activities, demonstrating this need, follows:

Activity	Number of weeks after OMB approval
Preparation for conducting the telephone survey	*Weeks 1-2*
Prepare/mail advance letters	
Prepare CATI system with approved questionnaire	
Conduct telephone survey	*Weeks 3-13*
Field telephone survey	
Monitor survey progress through weekly reports	
Input and analyze telephone survey data	*Weeks 14-23*
Clean data file and develop frequencies	
Run series of cross-tabulations for analysis	
Draft research brief on early survey analysis	*Weeks 18-22*
Draft research brief	
Finalize research brief	
Select and prepare for case studies	*Weeks 15-17*
Draft memo recommending potential sites for in-depth study	
Finalize list of sites for in-depth study	
Conduct case studies	*Weeks 18-30*
Schedule and conduct site visits and focus groups	
Write interview notes; analyze data	
Draft three topical papers	*Weeks 18-46*
Develop and disseminate final report	*Weeks 28-46*

Draft outline for final report
Draft final report
Submit final report and briefing materials
Presentation of findings
Post the final report on Internet

We anticipate that the questionnaire will be fielded beginning in the summer 2007 over 10 weeks with the case studies fielded in fall 2007. The data collection and analysis will take place over a 46-week period. Analysis of the survey questionnaire data will occur in fall 2007 and winter 2008 and analysis of the case study data will occur in winter 2008.

Once the telephone questionnaire has been fielded, we will clean the data and produce a fully documented and labeled dataset in either SPSS or SAS. We will also produce a "topline" questionnaire, i.e., an annotated questionnaire that shows weighted frequencies to all questions.

The report of the survey findings will include the survey methodology and the quality of the data, a description of the sampling frame and sampling procedures, a full disposition of all sampled telephone numbers, a discussion of problems encountered in administering the survey, and a calculation of standard errors for statistical tests based on the survey findings. The response rate will be reported, along with all of the raw data used to calculate the rate. The response rate will be calculated as a product of three individual rates: the contact rate, the cooperation rate, and the completion rate.

It is anticipated that a final report will be submitted to ASPE in Spring 2008. Copies of the report will be provided on the ASPE and Urban Institute websites after final approval and release by ASPE.

A16.1 Analysis Plan

Our analysis will use both the quantitative data obtained primarily from the survey of FBCOs, and the qualitative data obtained primarily from the case study interviews and focus groups. Some administrative and program data may be obtained during site visits and will be used to provide context and clarification of data collected during the semi-structured interviews.

The four main research questions will guide the data analysis for the study. In particular, the analysis will develop characteristics of the most common types of services provided by FBCOs immediately after the storms and later in the recovery process, and the types of FBCOs (including their size, age, and affiliations with other entities) most likely to carry out these functions. It will also describe the number and types of networks used by FBCOs to deliver services. The case studies will attempt to characterize different response models engaged in disaster relief—both those that describe structural relationships between FBCOs and among FBCOs and public agencies, and those that describe good practices, in order to generate findings on lessons learned about how FBCOs contributed to the disaster response, what worked, what did not, how responses might be improved in the future, and how FBCOs and public agencies might collaborate to produce a coordinated response.

A16.1.1. Analysis of the Telephone Survey Data

Analysis of the telephone survey will primarily use quantitative statistics to provide descriptive information on the number and types of services provided by FBCOs, the FBCO's staffing patterns and use of volunteers, the number and characteristics of people served, and the types of networks or collaborations that FBCOs participated in. In short, the analysis will address who was served, what types of service were delivered, and in anticipation of the case studies, how this was accomplished inter-organizationally. Data addressing the last point will be especially helpful in identifying candidates for case study.

The telephone survey will provide descriptive data to address in part each of the four broad research questions, and to generate correlates between organizational characteristics, services provided, and network affiliations. For example, it will provide descriptive data on which organizations served coordinating functions only, which provided direct services only, and which did both; what types of services by broad categories were provided; how soon after the storms and for how long these services were provided; and what challenges were experienced, as measured by broad close-ended categories or scaled to measure prevalence of the challenge. We will include, to the extent possible in a close-ended protocol, the modes of communication used in the immediate aftermath of the storms, and challenges of working with volunteers, and covering costs of services provided. To the extent that records were kept, data may be obtained on the numbers and characteristics of people served.

Analysis of the telephone survey will also provide descriptive statistics on the types of organizations with whom the respondent FBCO interacted to provide services, and for the three most important groups with which the respondent interacted, the identity and location of those organizations. This information will help identify the organizational and geographic reach of the responses, models that can be explored in-depth in the case studies, and information about partnerships and affiliations within those models.

The telephone survey data will be analyzed to identify the organizational types that are more active in particular aspects of service delivery. Potential breakout categories (sometimes called "control variables") are likely to include the size and age of the FBCO, its geographic location (e.g., urban/rural, proximity to areas of immediate impact), religious affiliation, membership in formal networks or collaborations, extent to which volunteers were used, or type(s) of service provided. For example, we might examine whether large FBCOs located within an X-mile radius of the most affected areas were more likely than smaller FBCOs in the same geographic radius to provide particular types of services. We might examine whether FBCOs with large numbers of volunteers or multiple networks, when controlled for religious affiliation, were more likely than those without such characteristics, to have provided particular types of services or have mobilized quickly. The survey data might also be used to examine the degree to which financial support affected the ability to provide relief activities, for example, whether unpaid volunteers were a substitute or complement to the availability of monetary resources, or whether certain types of FBCOs were more likely than others to have worked with national relief agencies.

Similarly, disaggregating the data might provide insights into the role of faith-based organizations in providing services. For example, we might examine whether low-income clients were more likely to be served by faith-based or community organizations, given the size, structure or religious mission of the FBCOs. These relationships are particularly important in understanding how FBCOs can ensure that needy populations are reached in future disaster scenarios.

A16.1.2. Analysis of the Case Study Data

As noted earlier, the cases will be selected to illustrate different response models, in order to explore the ways in which different organizational types and networks functioned to deliver services and to suggest good practices for effective disaster relief. The case studies will primarily use qualitative methods to examine complex relationships involving organizations of differing sizes, functions, culture and missions, and importantly, those that operate in urban or rural settings, and that serve communities of different race or socio-economic status.

Interview notes will be cleaned and reviewed by members of the team involved in the site visit and used to produce site summaries. The purpose of careful and timely cleaning of raw notes is to resolve any discrepancies between researchers' observations and to identify any need for clarification or additional data. Site summaries are intended to capture all relevant data collected during field investigation that address the research questions. The site summary of each case study, prepared using a consistent format, will present a descriptive "snapshot" of the central issues addressed in the visit, as well as relevant background information, to permit single site analyses and cross-site comparisons.

The case study data will permit an in-depth analysis to address the key research questions and amplify the findings from the telephone survey. They will provide detailed information on the basic questions of who provided services, what FBCOs actually did, when and where they did it, and how they did it. For example, from the case study interviews we expect to learn more about how quickly FBCOs were able to mobilize resources, staff, volunteers (and how and how well FBCOs were able to supervise volunteers), how much it cost and who paid for it. We will also be able to describe in detail what administrative structures, operating procedures, organizational experience, and inter-agency/inter-organizational agreements made these responses possible. We will be able to understand whether the FBCOs that provided relief services were principally those with prior social service or relief experience, or whether others were able to respond by connecting with other organizations or with public agencies. And conversely, we will be able to learn whether they tried and failed to make connections that could have made their efforts more effective. As part of the analysis plan, the research team will examine the geographical and client reach of the FBCO's services and the network(s) of responders that were part of each response.

We will also examine the factors that shaped the disaster response from a variety of perspectives—e.g., FBCO leaders, state and local officials, and clients. For example, the analysis will address how the FBCO adapted and functioned internally to deliver services, what affected the scope or intensity of response, how communication was established internally and across organizations and jurisdictions with whom the FBCO interacted. From the focus group data, we will elaborate on how individuals accessed services, what other organizations they interacted with to receive services, and how satisfied clients were with the services that they received.

Overall, the case study data will permit a nuanced understanding of what FBCOs tried to do, what worked, what didn't work, and why. From this analysis, we can begin to draw inferences about how the characteristics of the organizations affected the nature, intensity, duration, and scope of services delivered. Because we will conduct interviews and focus groups with different types of respondents (i.e., FBCO respondents, other members of the network, public officials, and to a limited extent service users), we will be able to compare and contrast perspectives on the effectiveness of relief responses and levels of unmet need.

Finally, the analysis of the data obtained in the field-based investigations will be used to develop structural models of disaster relief, such as an umbrella/affiliate structure, an ad hoc collaboration, or a newly created disaster response entity, as well as models of good practices based on characteristics of the organization or the network. For example, we will explore if good practices are correlated with a particular set of pre-existing relationships among a known circle of FBCOs and public agencies, or with disaster response protocols (e.g., leadership structures, chains of command, memoranda of understanding that define intra- or inter-organizational roles or financial support structures to activate in case of disaster). We will also explore the relationships between good practices and culture, mission, or other organizational attributes that facilitate effective disaster responses. From cross-site analysis, we will develop models (or typologies) that describe the relationships between key characteristics (e.g., type of FBCO, services provided, populations served, number and types of collaborations) and the accomplishments and/or challenges faced by FBCOs in providing relief/recovery services. The analysis will sharpen, sort, focus, and organize the data in ways that will permit hypotheses to be drawn and verified.

A16.2. Data Presentation

Various types of data display, primarily in the form of tables, matrices, and graphics, will be used to present information collected and develop formats that enhance the analysis and presentation. Wherever possible, these data displays will include the FBCOs surveyed as well as those selected for site visits.

The Matrix of Research Questions in Attachment E shows how the methodology of the survey and case study and each of the instruments will contribute to the study of the role of FBCOs in providing human services relief efforts in the aftermath of the storms. There is some intentional overlap between the survey and case studies in order to address the research questions from both a quantitative and qualitative perspective. The telephone survey will largely focus on research questions 1 and 2 and their subparts, while the case studies will explore the issues raised in research question 3, as well as provide more in-depth information to address questions 1and 2, and the challenges and best practices identified in the survey findings. Information from all sources will be used to address research question 4.

Overall, this is a descriptive study based on data collected from key stakeholders, e.g., the FBCOs surveyed and those studied through field-based case studies, public officials, and selected service recipients who will be asked to participate in focus groups as part of the case studies. It is not designed as an evaluation or impact study. The survey of FBCOs will provide a vital baseline of quantitative information that will be explored in more detail during the case studies. In combination, the survey data and the field-based interviews will permit us to develop a rich picture of the capabilities of FBCOs of different sizes, structures and affiliations, and the ways in which collaborations can work to improve disaster responses by FBCOs and public agencies at the local, state and federal levels.

A17. Expiration Date

The OMB approval number and expiration date will be displayed on all survey instruments and discussion guides.

A18. Certification Statement

There are no exceptions to the certification.

B. Collection of Information Employing Statistical Methods

B1. Respondent Universe and Sampling Methods

The respondent universe is FBCOs located in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Houston that were in critical geographic areas for mounting relief/recovery efforts after hurricanes Katrina and Rita, namely: (a) FBCOs in the directly impacted areas of the storm; (b) those in areas adjacent to or near the impacted areas; and (c) those away from the impacted areas but still in the states of Louisiana and Mississippi, and in Houston, one of the major evacuee receiving areas. We will use the extent of postal service disruption as a proxy for defining and operationalizing these concepts. For example, zip code areas in which postal service was totally disrupted and mail service was not available will be regarded as the directly impacted areas. Zip code areas in which mail service was partially available after the storm will be considered the nearby areas, and zip code areas that were within Louisiana, Mississippi, and Houston but had no interruption of mail service will be considered the outer boundaries of the study. Information on zip codes will be derived from the U.S. Postal Service, "Impact of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita on Post Office Operations."

We will draw a sample of FBCOs from this universe for the telephone survey and case studies. This design will enable the study to investigate various types and extent of assistance that FBCOs conducted relative to their geographic proximity to the storm and the networks that were used as part of the response effort. The plan proposed below is designed to meet rigorous research standards within the time and budget constraints of the study.

B1.1 Creating a Master List

Because there is no master list of FBCOs in the geographic region of interest, it is necessary to create one. Given the outpouring of contributions and assistance that flowed into the Gulf Coast region after the storm, it is impossible to generate a complete list of all organizations that responded to the crisis. We therefore will focus on identifying FBCOs from the two states most impacted by the storms (i.e., Louisiana and Mississippi), plus one of the major evacuee receiving areas (namely, Houston) as the basis for the telephone survey.

To create a relatively complete list of FBCOs, we will use two primary sources, crosschecked with lists of FBCOs obtained by our local partners. The first source will be the American Church List. The American Church List is one of the most widely used sources for obtaining directories of congregations and houses of worship in the United States. We will purchase a list of congregations and houses of worship in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Houston. This database can be sorted by geographic area to pinpoint locations of interest. The second source will be the Urban Institute's National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS) database. The NCCS database contains all nonprofit organizations with annual gross receipts of $25,000 or more, which file a Form 990 with the Internal Revenue Service. We will create a list of nonprofit human service community-based organizations in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Houston from the NCCS database.

By purchasing lists of congregations and houses of worship from the American Church List and using the information on community-based, human service nonprofits in the NCCS database, we will have a reasonably complete list of FBCOs in the geographic areas of interest (i.e., Louisiana, Mississippi, and Houston), which will enhance our ability to generalize to the larger population for this region. These lists contain information on FBCOs of various sizes and cover most Judeo-Christian faiths.[3]

In addition, our local partners (the Louisiana Association of Nonprofit Organizations and the Mississippi Center for Nonprofits) will obtain lists of FBCOs that participated in the relief/recovery efforts from various other sources, such as the governor's office and relief agencies. These locally obtained lists will be crosschecked with the American Church List and NCCS list to improve the completeness of the master list and reduce potential coverage bias. Duplicate entries will be discarded so that each FBCO appears only once in the master list. The lists obtained by our local partners may also provide us with additional contact information for FBCOs that can be matched across lists.

B1.2 Determining Stratification Criteria

Stratification decisions will focus on three main critical elements that are likely to affect the types of relief services provided and the networks used in providing services: (1) the geographic location of the responding FBCO (i.e., distance from the areas of the storm's immediate impact); (2) the size of the FBCO; and (3) religious denomination or affiliation or type of organization. All three elements may be important for understanding the types of responses, level of effort, and structure of relief/recovery networks in the aftermath of the storms. The sample selection criteria will be limited to up to three of these factors, so the subsample sizes are not too small for statistical analysis. When the master list is complete, we will run frequency distributions on the entries to determine the number of cases that contain any or all of the critical elements. We will also review the critical elements to determine the range and specificity of the information.

Because the proposed lists will contain an address or telephone contact, we will be able to stratify by geography. More problematic will be obtaining sufficient information on size, organization type, and denomination to use these elements as stratification criteria. We will determine how many FBCOs in the list have provided their religious denomination and how many specific denominations are named. Based on this analysis, we will be able to determine: (a) if there is a sufficient number of cases with this type of information to use the element as a stratification criterion; and (b) if we are able to group the information into logical categories (such as, small, medium, and large organizations). In the event that we cannot stratify by size, type, or denomination, we will ask for this information as part of the telephone survey so we will be able to include these criteria in the analysis.

B1.3 Sampling Methods

The sampling methods for the telephone survey and the case studies are described separately.

---

3 The sample is likely to under-represent non- Judeo-Christian faiths, however we believe this will be a small bias for the geographic area of interest. When possible, we will supplement the American Church List with information obtained by our local associates regarding non-Judeo-Christian houses of worship.

Telephone Survey. The sample design for the telephone survey calls for a random sample of FBCOs in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Houston, stratified by geography. As indicated above, we may expand the stratification criteria to include size of the FBCO, or religious affiliation, if there are a sufficient number of cases with this type of information in the master file. The resulting sample will enable us to generalize to the broader population of FBCOs in our universe.

Because we do not have pre-existing information on the universe of FBCOs that provided relief/recovery services after the storms, the sampling strategy will depend, in part, on the distribution of organizations that are reflected in the master list. At a minimum, we plan to stratify by geography using state and zip code as the basic stratifying criteria. Zip codes will be classified into three groups: (1) those entirely within the directly impacted areas; (2) those that touch on or are partially in the directly impacted areas; and (3) those outside the impacted areas, but in other parts of Louisiana and Mississippi, and in Houston. Zip codes can also be used to approximate rural, urban, or mixed (rural/urban) locations.

We will initially draw a sample of 600 FBCOs that will serve as the sampling pool for the telephone survey. Our goal is to achieve approximately 200 completed interviews, with a margin of error due to sampling at the 95 percent confidence interval for any estimated proportion based on the total sample, that is, at most ±5 percent. The strategy for achieving this response rate is discussed under section B.3, below.

To select the 600 FBCOs, we will develop sampling criteria to reflect the universe of the master list. For example, if 60 percent of the FBCOs in the list are from Louisiana, we will randomly select 60 percent of the sample (i.e., 360 FBCOs) from FBCOs with a Louisiana address. The greater the number of sampling criteria (such as sampling by size and geographic location), the smaller each cell size will be for specific criterion (e.g., for small FBCOs in Louisiana). We therefore plan to limit the selection criteria to no more than two or three factors. Stratifying by size and denomination/affiliation will be undertaken if the information on the master list is sufficient to allow reasonable classification along these dimensions. If we cannot stratify by size and/or denomination/affiliation, we will obtain measures of these factors in the telephone survey.

Case Studies. The selection of FBCOs for the case studies will be based on preliminary information derived from the telephone survey and feedback from our local advisors and TAG. The cases will be selected to illustrate different types of response models in order to explore the ways in which different organizational types and networks functioned in the delivery of relief services and to suggest good practices for effective disaster relief. While there are too few case studies to provide a statistically or nationally representative sample, we will strive for a sample that gives a picture of a variety of experiences encountered. For example, in selecting the case studies, we will look for FBCOs that illustrate differing sizes, functions, cultures and missions, and levels of affiliation, and ones that operate in urban or rural settings, and serve communities of different racial/ethnic or socio-economic groups.

B2. Procedures for the Collection of Information

B2.1 Initial Contact

Telephone Survey. An introductory letter (Attachment F) will be sent from the Public Policy Research Lab (PPRL) at Louisiana State University to executive directors and clergy of the 600 FBCOs that were selected in the sample. The letter describes the purpose of the survey, the authority for data collection, that participation is voluntary, and that information collected in the survey will be treated as private within the limits of the law. The recipient will be given contact information at the PPRL and Urban Institute, if they desire additional information about the study.

Case Studies. Selected case study organizations will be sent a letter (Attachment G) informing them of the study and requesting their participation. FBCOs will then be contacted to arrange the local site visit. The initial telephone contact will provide background about the project and seek additional information on organizations and partners in order to identify key respondents. Based on this information, we will contact respondents and determine the best timing for the visit in order to accommodate the schedule of local respondents.

B2.2 Training

Telephone Survey. PPRL will assign a team of professional interviewers to this study to conduct the data collection activities. Before data collection begins, the interviewers will receive training specific to the project and survey instrument. The training will focus on the objectives of the study and on procedures to follow in difficult interviewing situations. PPRL will go over the entire questionnaire with the interviewers and explain the purpose of the questions, definitional issues, and how to handle respondent confusion or ambiguous responses and skip patterns, and how to code the answers. The Urban Institute will oversee the preparation and delivery of the interviewer training; PPRL will conduct the training sessions, which are expected to take approximately three-four hours to complete.

Case Studies. The case study site visits will be conducted by two-person teams drawn from Urban Institute staff and composed of one senior and one junior staff member. Senior staff on this project are experienced in field-based qualitative research and semi-structured interviewing of the type that will be used in this study. All Urban Institute staff involved in the fieldwork will be trained with respect to the objectives of the study and the procedures to follow during the site visits. In the training, team members will review the different discussion guides, become familiar with the types of information sought in the study, and, through role playing, practice their interviewing, listening, and note taking techniques. It is anticipated that the training will take approximately four hours.

B2.3 Quality Control Procedures

Telephone Survey. To ensure quality control during the survey's data collection phase, PPRL supervisors will closely monitor the initial interviews and help the interviewers with any unanticipated problems, including review of how to handle problematic responses, which may arise in the first few days of fielding the survey. After the initial field period, PPRL will monitor interviews intermittently and review field progress weekly.

During the data collection phase of the study, PPRL will send weekly updates via email to the Urban Institute on the number of FBCOs that had been contacted, the number of interviews scheduled, the number of interviews completed, and the number of hard and soft refusals. These updates will be used to monitor the completion or response rate and to make adjustments, if necessary. Communication between PPRL and Urban Institute will also be maintained through frequent phone calls, and the HHS-ASPE Project Officer will be updated regularly on the progress of the survey.

Case Studies. Prior to visiting sites or speaking with any potential respondents, Urban Institute staff will review all available materials about the local site and the selected FBCO. This will enable us to identify the appropriate individuals to interview on site who can best inform the central questions in the study. We will also rely heavily on our local partners, TAG members, and other informants to guide this work.

As noted earlier and is common practice with field-based research, project staff will produce detailed notes of their interviews and a full site summary of each case study, both of which are reviewed by fellow team members to ensure that gaps or inconsistencies are resolved in a timely fashion, and the data are reliable for analysis and production of briefing memoranda and the final report.

B3. Methods to Maximize Response Rates and Deal with Nonresponse

Telephone Survey. Prior to the start of data collection, the 600 selected FBCOs will be prescreened to determine if they still exist, participated in the relief effort, and can be contacted by telephone. Various efforts will be made to obtain up-to-date contact information, including Internet searches, directory matches, and possibly reverse matching services. If after repeated effort we cannot verify the existence of the group or secure a current contact number, we will replace the FBCO in the sample by using the same random selection procedure described above. In addition, we will also replace at random those organizations that said they did not participate in the relief effort.

We will use a 10-call design for the survey—that is, a minimum of 10 attempts will be made to contact every sampled FBCO, staggered over different times of the day and days of the week to maximize the chance of making contact with the FBCO. If an individual cannot answer the survey immediately, the interviewer will schedule a time to call back to complete the survey. A 10-call attempt should be more than adequate since most of the sampled organizations will have been pre-qualified with updated contact information.

Several techniques will be used to facilitate a high response rate and achieve 200 completed interviews. First, although we expect to draw a sample of approximately 600 FBCOs, we will not release all of the names and contact information at one time. Once we have completed the prescreening process, we will randomly divide the 600 into 12 release groups (i.e., 50 FBCOs per group) and release the sample in waves, starting with the first 5 groups, and tracking the number of completed interviews, scheduled interviews, refusals, and incorrect/inoperable telephone numbers. This will enable us to monitor the projected response rate. As needed, additional names will be released from the pool of 600 FBCOs until we complete the target of 200 respondents. Depending on the contact and response rates during data collection, it is possible that the study could be completed with as few as five release groups, but most likely we will need all twelve release groups to complete the data collection. Releasing the sample in waves increases the likelihood of achieving a high response rate because the response rate is sensitive to the size of the released sample (that is, the denominator); we will use the smallest sample possible to generate the targeted number of completed questionnaires.

Second, PPRL at LSU will send an advance letter to the pool of 600 FBCOs summarizing the purpose, sponsorship and other relevant details to encourage participation and provide legitimacy for the survey. Although some of these letters may not reach their intended recipients because of continuing mail disruption in the most affected areas, we believe that the majority of FBCOs will be reached in this way to notify them of the study. Additionally, PPRL will make available to FBCOs its toll-free 800-number to schedule interviews at times that are convenient for the FBCOs. Although many surveys of FBOs achieve relatively low response rates (typically 20-30 percent and generally, less than 50 percent), we have found from our interactions with service providers and others in Louisiana since the storms that they are eager to share their experiences and are grateful for an opportunity to tell their stories to outsiders. We therefore anticipate a relatively high level of cooperation and expect a response rate of 80 percent.

Case Studies. For the case studies, it is expected that all (or nearly all) of the FBCOs we approach will agree to participate in the study. We will work closely with our partners in Louisiana and Mississippi to engage these FBCOs and assuage any concerns about participating in the study. Once we have secured the selected sites, site visitors will work closely with a person assigned to be the primary contact at the FBCO to help in scheduling the site visit. One member of the two-person site visit team will take responsibility for working with the primary contact person to handle the scheduling and logistics of the site visit. For the site visits, the logistical discussion will include recruitment of focus group participants and arranging a time and location for the focus groups. Dates for site visits will be made at least one month ahead of time to permit ample time to schedule interviews. Scheduled interview appointments will then be confirmed via email the week prior to the visit. We will request that a quiet setting that is as private as possible (e.g., a conference room) be made available to interview those who do not have private offices, in order to encourage respondents to feel they can talk freely. Based on our experience, following these established field visit protocols leads to an interview completion rate approaching 100 percent of those scheduled in advance.

To ensure that the desired number of people attend the focus group sessions (i.e., 6-10 people), we will need to over-recruit to allow for the incidence of no-shows. We estimate that we will need between 16-20 people to agree to attend a focus group session to ensure a group of sufficient size. We will work closely with our site contact to recruit focus group participants and provide the contact with the necessary information. A small monetary incentive will be offered to potential focus group participants to help encourage their participation. Once focus group candidates are identified, they will be contacted by telephone to fully inform them about the purpose of the focus group and determine whether they are willing to participate. These candidates will be called by telephone two-three days prior to the focus group to remind them about the session and address any outstanding questions or concerns.

B4. Tests of Procedures or Methods to be Undertaken

The estimated response time for the telephone survey is based upon a pretest conducted with 7 FBCOs located in the Gulf Coast region. The range of time to complete the survey was 15 to 25 minutes. We believe that the range in time reflects the size of the FBCO as well as the extent of automated data systems. A few minor revisions were made to the survey questionnaire to limit the response time to no more than 20 minutes, on average, to complete.

Telephone Survey. PPRL pre-tested the telephone survey instrument, using seven FBCOs in the Gulf Region: five in Louisiana, one in Mississippi, and one in Houston. The FBCOs were of different sizes with budgets ranging from less than $10,000 to $5 million. Four respondents were faith-based organizations and three were community-based nonprofits. The seven FBCOs participating in the pretest were:

- Harvest Ripe Church; 423 Amelia Street; Gretna, LA 70053
- Accountability Church; 33719 La Highway 16; Denham Springs, LA 70706
- First Church of God; 210 South Briggs Street; Oak Grove, LA 71263
- Alexandria Electrical Joint Apprenticeship Committee; 6703 Masonic Drive; Alexandria, LA 71301
- Houma-Terrebonne Civic Center Development Corporation; 346 Civic Center Blvd.; Houma, LA 70360
- Silver Cross Home; 503 Silver Cross Drive; Brookhaven, MS 39601
- Trinity Lutheran Church; 800 Houston Ave; Houston, TX 77007

Results of the pretest were used to refine the telephone survey instrument and study procedures. The results of the pretest were submitted to HHS/ASPE on June 14, 2007.

Case Studies. Case study instruments were reviewed for content, methodology, and burden estimate by our TAG members. The instruments have been revised to reflect comments by these reviewers and the research team, who have conducted many similar studies. Overall, reviewers report that the discussion guides capture the intended data and in the prescribed amount of time to minimize burden on respondents.

B5. Individuals Consulted on Statistics and on Collecting and/or Analyzing Data

The agency responsible for funding the study, determining its overall design and approach, and receiving and approving contract deliverables is:

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Planning and Evaluation

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
200 Independence Ave. SW, Room 404-E
Washington, DC 20201

Person Responsible: Alana Landey (phone: 202-401-6636; email: Alana.Landey@HHS.GOV)

The Urban Institute is the prime contractor for this study. It is responsible for implementing the overall design of the study and development of the data collection instruments. It will field the case studies using its own staff, and will have responsibility for all data analyses obtained through the telephone survey, case studies, and focus groups.

The Urban Institute
2100 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
(202) 833-7200

Persons Responsible: Carol De Vita and Fredrica Kramer, Co-Principal Investigators
Timothy Triplett, Survey Associate and Statistical Expert

Direct Contact Information:
De Vita (phone: 202-261-5232; email: cdevita@ui.urban.org)
Kramer (phone: 202-261-5399; email: fkramer@ui.urban.org)
Triplett (phone: 202-261-5579; email: ttriplett@ui.urban.org)

The Public Policy Research Laboratory at Louisiana State University is a subcontractor in this study. It will field the telephone survey and provide a raw data file to the Urban Institute.

Public Policy Research Laboratory
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803

Person Responsible: Steven Procopio (phone: 225-578-7499; email: sproco1@lsu.edu)

The Louisiana Association of Nonprofit Organizations (LANO) and the Mississippi Center for Nonprofits (MCN) will serve as local partners with the Urban Institute team. These organizations will secure local lists of FBCOs that participated in the post-hurricane relief/recovery efforts and help identify potential FBCOs for site visits during the case study phase of the project.

Persons Responsible: Susan Hymel and Dorothy Thomas, both of LANO
Susan Weifhar, MCN

LANO | Mississippi Center for Nonprofits

P.O. Box 3808
Baton Rouge, LA 70802

700 North Street – Suite 201
Jackson, MS 39202

Director Contact Information:
Susan Hymel (phone: 225-925-2390; email: susan@lano.org)
Dorothy Thomas (phone: 703-581-3989; email: Dorothy@lano.org)
Susan Weifhar (phone: 601-968-0061, ext. 16; email: sue@msnonprofits.org)

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: FBCO Telephone Questionnaire
Attachment B: Principal for Case Study Discussion Guide
Attachment C: Affiliate/Other Organization Discussion Guide
Attachment D: Focus Group Conversation Guide
Attachment E: Matrix of Research Questions
Attachment F: Introductory Letter for Telephone Questionnaire
Attachment G: Advance Letter for Case Study