

MEMORANDUM

OMB # 1850-0803 v.27

DATE: May 19, 2010

TO: Shelly Martinez
Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget

FROM: Patricia Etienne
National Center for Education Statistics

THROUGH: Kashka Kubzdela
National Center for Education Statistics

SUBJECT: Response to OMB passback on NAEP 2011 Writing Assessment Audiovisual Stimuli
Cognitive Interviews Study

1. Screening instrument. The materials mention a screening instrument but we do not seem to have received it. Please provide.

The student and parent screening instruments are attached in the revised [Appendixes NAEP 2011 Writing Assessment Audiovisual Stimuli Cognitive Interviews.doc](#).

2. Incentives. We are willing to go above the “going rate” of \$40 for a cognitive interview given that there are essentially two “participants” per family from a time commitment perspective in this case. However, we wonder about the choice to pay via gift cards, especially for parents, since normally cog. labs pay via check. And we also wonder about the “split” of most of the funds going to the child (which seems a little unprecedented especially for 8th graders), and a relatively nominal amount going to the parent. Can you provide the logic for these two things and/or thoughts for adjusting the strategy?

We have revised the incentive amounts to be a \$25 check for the parent and a \$30 gift card for the student. We are worried that anything less than \$30 is unlikely to be attractive enough to students, given that this is outside of school hours and will take 1.5 hours plus travel time.

Regarding the use of gift cards, 8th grade students may have difficulty cashing checks and most NAEP-related studies have successfully used gift cards as a means of remuneration over the past few years. We will provide a check to the parent.

3. Confidentiality. All Gen IC materials should be changed to reflect these two items.
 - a. Under this ICR, confidentiality should be pledged by NCES, not “NAEP,” which as a program is not the entity entitled to promise confidentiality.
 - b. Further, per the Supporting Statement, the confidentiality should be pledged under ESRA, not CIPSEA. This seems especially appropriate given videotaping and other cognitive lab activities such as recruitment and consent forms that involve the collection and retention of PII. See SS A10, which says in part:

Assurance of Confidentiality

Each respondent will be assured that all information identifying them or their school will be kept confidential in compliance with the legislation (Education Sciences Reform Act (P.L.107-110, 20 U.S.C. §9010):

Revisions have been made to Section 7 of Volume I, Section 2 of Volume II, and to the various consent forms in the Appendixes document to reflect OMB’s feedback regarding confidentiality.