



ates

United
Department
Agriculture

Food and
Nutrition
Service

3101 Park
Center Drive

Date March 16, 2011
To Hoke Wilson and Ted Macaluso
Cc Katie Heintz, Marianne Beauregard
From Ann Collins
Subject Changes to the OMB package

Alexandria, VA
22302-1500

Below please find a summary of changes in response to the OMB conference call we had last Thursday. I believe that these bullets can be used to describe accurately the changes that we made to the package in response to the OMB's request and can be used in a cover memo or letter from FNS.

- **Revisions to Supporting Document A.** We made the following changes in this document.
 - In the overview of the evaluation section, added a short section describing the differences in goals for the evaluation's proof-of-concept (school year 2010-11) and the full demonstration (school year 2011-12) years.
 - In Exhibit A.1., which provides an overview of the research objectives, outcomes, data sources, and analysis, we added a column indicating which analysis will be completed for the only demonstration year, as opposed to both the proof-of-concept and demonstration years.
 - We incorporated sentences at the end of the description of the food security measure indicating that it can be used to compare impacts of other FNS initiatives that aim to address very low food security among children.
 - In Section A.1., in reference to the Institutional Review Board, we will indicate that we received IRB approval in late February.
 - We revised Exhibit A.2, which shows the topics to be asked of the key informants for the process study, and added a paragraph indicating that there will be three rounds of interviews with key informants during each year of the study.
 - Finally, we revised Exhibit A.3., which shows estimated respondent burden, to provide details about each of the waves of interviews in both years by respondent type. Per OMB's request, we revised the table to specify, for each year individual waves of interviews with the same respondents, although this means that some respondents appear multiple times in the same year. We also adjusted the burden estimates somewhat after reviewing the topic guides created for each respondent type (see related bullet below).

- **Revisions to Supporting Document B.** We added a section to B.2.2. (Estimation Procedures) indicating difference in analyses for Year 1 and Year 2. When reviewing that section, we also realized there is no mention of the process study analysis and included a brief section about that analysis.
- **We provided updated baseline and follow-up household instruments** (Appendices A and B), with revised consent language as approved by the IRB. We also added a question asking where the focal child will be during the summer. The Spanish language versions were similarly updated. You will note that, while the questions in the English version of the baseline interview remain the same, the formatting is somewhat different because it reflects the CATI programming (mostly numbering of response categories and skip patterns) that is currently being undertaken in order to get into the field immediately upon OMB clearance.
- **We simplified and revised the process study protocols** (Appendices D and E). They are now organized by major respondent groups, (e.g., grantees and partners receiving grant funding, school food authorities, summer food program sponsors, retailers, and community-based organizations). These are revised for all three waves of data collection: spring, summer, and fall.
- **We submitted the official letter of IRB approval.** (Appendix G.)
- **We combined what were originally two advance letters into one letter** (Part of Appendix H). That letter also has been revised to include information required by the evaluator's IRB.
- **Consent letter/language.** There was some confusion during the call about whether the evaluation included a consent letter. This may have come from the fact that excerpted consent language from the household and process study instruments was included in a separate appendix (Appendix L) and it was not clear that this was consent language to be read verbally at the beginning of both the household and process study interviews. We have updated this appendix to include the revised consent language and have made it clearer that the appendix includes scripts to be read at the beginning of the interviews and that the same language is found at the beginning of the corresponding instruments.

Please let me know if you have any questions.