

Cover page

Program Contact: Andra Tharp, PhD

Submission Date: August 31, 2012

Required documentation for complete submission:

- | | | |
|----|---|----------|
| 1. | Justification Memo: | Below |
| 2. | Supporting Statement Part A: | Attached |
| 3. | Supporting Statement Part B: | Attached |
| 4. | Draft 30-day and 60-day FRN: | Attached |
| 5. | Privacy Act statement: | Attached |
| 6. | Part I Worksheet: | Attached |
| 7. | Part II Worksheets for each data collection instrument: | Attached |
| 8. | Attachments/Appendices: authorizing legislation, Comments from 60-day FRN; data collection instrument(s); Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval letter: | Attached |

Circumstances of Revision Request for OMB 0920-0941

This is a revision request for OMB #0920-0941, which received approval through July 2015 for the multi-site evaluation of Dating Matters (4 cities, 44 schools). The comprehensive study has both outcome and process evaluation components and includes multiple assessments.

The current revision request has two aims:

- 1) Request to revise follow-up outcome evaluation instruments and drop mid-year outcome evaluation student survey, and**
- 2) Request to add process evaluation instruments to enhance implementation.**

1) Regarding the first aim, Dating Matters grantees and contractors had one year for planning prior to implementation. During the planning year, contractors made edits to evaluation instruments to enhance the connection with the final program and to eliminate redundant or unnecessary items. As described in detail below, these changes are minor and fully consistent with the focus and scope of what was already approved.

In working with our grantees and schools over the planning year, it also became clear that our original plan to collect baseline, mid-year, and follow-up surveys from students would create too much burden for schools. To be responsive to the schools' needs, we are proposing to drop the mid-year student survey. We believe that given the variation in implementation of the student curricula across schools (some classrooms in some schools will implement the curricula in the fall, some in the spring) and the added burden to schools, we could remove the mid-year survey without losing critical information about program effects. Therefore, the project is now requesting approval for these changes that resulted during the planning year as a function of finalizing the program materials, clarifying instructions, responding to school concerns, and shortening several instruments.

2) Regarding the second aim, as a result of grantees' planning processes, we identified additional needs for the process evaluation. For example, it became clear that because the 6th and 7th grade parent curricula were new, we should assess not only implementer's fidelity to the sessions (in previously approved instruments) but also parents' satisfaction with the program. Therefore, we are requesting to add five new process evaluation instruments (with accompanying screenshots, consent, and assent forms as appropriate) and one new version of an outcome evaluation instrument that will assist CDC, our contractors, and grantees in monitoring and improving program implementation.

In addition, the development of our capacity and readiness assessment was delayed. Although two of the three parts of the assessment were completed in time for our initial submission (school leadership and local health department capacity and readiness assessments), our contractor did not complete the third component of the assessment (community advisory board capacity and readiness assessment) until this summer. Therefore, we are requesting to add this third and final component to the capacity and readiness assessment.

We want to emphasize that even with the revision of follow-up instruments and addition of process evaluation instruments, the methods and design of the Dating Matters evaluation are unchanged. There has been no change related to individually identifiable information.

The changes described above are reflected in the revised Supporting Statement A and B and are summarized in the table below. Because of the decision to drop the mid-year student survey, the changes result in an overall **decrease** in burden and burden cost:

	Total Burden Hours	Total Burden Cost
Approved	35,099	\$421,415.69
Proposed	27,923	\$374,389.09
Difference	-7176	-\$47,026.60

To clarify exactly what changes are proposed, we first describe the new instruments (also discussed in SSA and SSB) and summarize the purpose and change to each revised instrument. In subsequent tables we itemize exactly which changes have been made to the three revised instruments.

Table Linking Changes Described Above to Specific Attachments						
REVISED						
Attachment	Description	Nature of change	Justification	Change in Burden		
Attachment E	Student Outcome Evaluation Survey-Follow-up	Request to Revise	Streamlined, item duplication removed	0		
Attachment F	Student Outcome Survey-Mid-Term	Request to Drop	Drop mid-point survey to reduce data collection burden on schools	-8019		
Attachment EEEE	Parent Outcome Survey-Follow-up	Request to Revise	Streamlined, item duplication removed	0		
EXPANDED AND NEW						
Attachment	Description	Justification	# of Respondents	# of Responses	Burden Hours/Response	Total Burden Hours
Attachment IIII	Educator Outcome Evaluation Survey-Follow-up	In original request baseline and follow-up surveys were the same. In change request a baseline version was created (Attachment I). The current request involves creating a follow-up version of the survey	1584	1	30/60	792*
Attachment JJJJ and HHHH (screenshots):	Community Capacity/Readiness Assessment	The community capacity/readiness assessment is the third and final component of capacity/readiness assessment. We request to add this component to our information collection. The request is proposed now because the contractor who developed instrument did not finalize it until Summer 2012.	80	1	1	+80
Attachment KKKK:	Communications Focus Groups Guide	The focus group research component of the evaluation has been expanded to include the communications program. These groups will be used to test and improve the communications materials.	96	1	1.5	+144
Attachment LLLL:	Parent Program Manager TA Tracking Form	The technical assistance tracking system has been expanded to include both on-site master trainers: the student program master trainer (previously approved) and parent program manager (requested)	4	50	10/60	+33
Attachment MMMM:	6 th Grade Curricula Parent Satisfaction Questionnaire	Questionnaire added to assess parents' satisfaction and engagement in parent curricula to assist in program improvement and sustainability	1890	1	10/60	+315
Attachment NNNN:	7 th Grade Curricula Parent Satisfaction Questionnaire	Questionnaire added to assess parents' satisfaction and engagement in parent curricula to assist in program improvement and sustainability	1890	1	10/60	+315
Attachment OOOO	Student Assent for Communications Focus Group Participation (see Attachment KKKK)	Assent Form (No burden)			0	0
Attachment PPPP	Parent Consent for Student Communications Focus Group Participation (see Attachment KKKK)	Consent Form (No burden)			0	0

* Please note that the burden for Attachment IIII was already approved as part of Attachment I. We had anticipated using the same version of this survey for baseline and follow-up and have since created two versions of this instrument. As described in SSB, we expect a 95% response rate for the baseline survey (Attachment I) and 90% response rate for follow-up (Attachment IIII). The previous package estimated burden based on 95% response at both time points. Therefore, although the burden associated with Attachment IIII is 792 hours, this is actually a reduction of 44 hours from the previous request where 95% follow-up was expected for both administrations of Attachment I.

Revisions itemized below in modified, deleted, and added item tables:

Itemized proposed changes in Attachments—Modified items:			
Form	Reason	Number	Question
Attachment E	Language simplified for comprehension.	7	Please give your answers based on how things have been for you in the last six months.
Attachment E	Added sometime because Yes/No responses were not sufficient.	11	Response Options: Always; Sometimes; Never
Attachment E	Broken into two separate questions to accommodate skip pattern for respondents who have not dated someone who was a different age.	13-14	13. Have you ever dated someone who is a different age than yourself? o Yes o No o If No, skip to Question 15 14. How much older or younger was that person? o 1-year difference o 2-year difference o More than 3 years difference in age
Attachment E	Language simplified for comprehension.	15	How many different people have you dated <u>since you began dating</u> ?
Attachment E	Reference period changed to accommodate respondents who answering in regard to a dating relationship in the past.	24	Please indicate how often each of the following statements is true currently or was true in your most recent dating relationship.
Attachment E	Change from months to initials to remind respondents of who they are describing.	25a	a. The person I am thinking about when filling out this questionnaire has these initials: _____.
Attachment E	Respondents may have multiple caregivers (for example, a mother and a father). Language was changed to accommodate this scenario.	26	From the list below, choose the one adult in your home who is the main person who takes care of you. If there is more than one person who takes care of you, select the one you spend the most time with.
Attachment E	Reference period changed to capture discrete time period between fall survey iteration (baseline) and spring survey iteration (follow-up).	52	In the past 6 months, how often did you:
Attachment E	Alcohol-related items collapsed into single item to reduce length of questionnaire.	44a	Drank more than a sip of beer, wine, wine coolers, or liquor (like whiskey or gin)?
Attachment E	Added examples of inhalants to improve students' comprehension of the question	44e	Used inhalants? (sniffing glue, huffing, whippits)
Attachment E	Specified illegal drugs to differentiate from legal non-prescription drugs.	44f	Used other illegal drugs (cocaine, crack, meth, heroin)?
Attachment EEEE	Text edited for clarity (i.e., respondent may interpret as literally the same building or house).	18	How many years have you lived together with your Middle School child (even if you moved homes)?
Attachment EEEE	Reference period added to focus attention of respondent on recent events.	30	In the past month, when you talked about dating, did you tell your child...
Attachment EEEE	Text changed to make questions applicable to both girls and boys.	31e	How many times have you ever talked to your child about what to do to keep from getting pregnant or getting someone else pregnant?
Attachment EEEE	Wording changed on three questions regarding participation in parenting programs to make clear that these questions are asking about travel and time spent on any of the three Dating Matters parent curricula	84	How long does it take you to get to a single Dating Matters parent program event? (Estimate your average travel time one way)
		85	How far do you travel (mileage) to participate in a session of the Dating Matters parent program? (Estimate your average travel distance one way)
		86	How many Dating Matters parent program sessions have you attended so far this year?

Itemized proposed changes in Attachments—Deleted items:		
Form	Reason	Question
Attachment E	Item was dropped due to concerns about whether the respondents could complete this item reliably.	28. In a typical week, how many days from 0-7 do you eat a meal with your family?
Attachment E	Question dropped because most respondents are under the legal driving age, they would not be driving and would not have a reason to drive a car without the owner's permission.	Item 4 from Delinquency Scale ...drive a car without its owner's permission?
Attachment E	Technology-based harassment items dropped to reduce length of questionnaire.	1a) Someone made a rude or mean comment to me online 1d) Someone tried to get me to talk about sex online when I did not want to. 1e) Someone asked me for sexual information about myself when I did not want to tell the person, e.g., really personal questions, like what my body looks like or sexual things I have done. 2a) Made rude or mean comments to anyone online. 2d) Tried to get someone else to talk about sex online when they did not want to.
Attachment F	Reduce burden on schools	All items removed (as described above)
Attachment EEEE	Item was dropped due to concerns about whether the respondents could complete this item reliably.	Can your child tell how you are feeling without asking you?

Itemized proposed changes in Attachments—Added items:			
Form	Reason	Number	Question Text
Attachment EEEE	Added two questions about parent program attendance and about participating in at-home sessions of parents programs for the purpose of estimating cost of participation	83	Have you participated in a Dating Matters parent program? -Yes, I participated in the 6 th grade parent curriculum, Parents Matter! -If yes, proceed to question 86 -Yes, I participated in the 7 th grade parent curriculum—If yes, proceed to question 86 -Yes, I participated in the 8 th grade parent curriculum, Families for Safe Dates, which is done in the home—if yes proceed to question 89 --No, I have not participated in a Dating Matters parent program—If no, survey now completed—return survey
		87	Some of the Dating Matters parent curricula involve doing sessions or activities at home. How much time did you spend on at home sessions/activities for your Dating Matters curriculum? -I participated in the 6 th grade curriculum, with no at home activities -An hour or less -Over an hour to two hours -Over 2 hours to 4 hours --Over 4 hours to 6 hours -Over 6 hours to 8 hours -Over 8 hours to 10 hours -Over 10 hours