

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation and
Family and Youth Services Bureau,
Administration for Children and Families
330 C Street, SW, 4th floor
Washington, DC 20201
Project Officers: Caryn Blitz, Seth Chamberlain

**Part A: Justification for the
Collection of Implementation
Survey Data - Personal
Responsibility Education
Program (PREP) Multi-
Component Evaluation**

0970-0398

July 2016

CONTENTS

PART A: JUSTIFICATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION DATA COLLECTION.....	1
A1. Circumstances making the collection of information necessary.....	1
1. The Personal Responsibility Education Program (PREP).....	1
2. The PREP Evaluation.....	1
3. The Design and Implementation Study (DIS) - Implementation Survey.....	3
A.2. Purpose and use of the information collected.....	3
A.3. Use of information technology to reduce burden.....	6
A.4. Efforts to identify duplication and use of similar information.....	7
A.5. Impact on small businesses.....	8
A.6. Consequences of not collecting the information/collecting less frequently.....	8
A.7. Special circumstances.....	8
A.8. <i>Federal Register</i> notice and consultation outside the agency.....	8
A.9. Payments to respondents.....	9
A.10. Assurances of confidentiality.....	9
A.11. Justification for sensitive questions.....	10
A.12. Estimates of the burden of data collection.....	10
1. Estimate of Annual Burden.....	10
2. Estimates of Annual Costs.....	10
3. Overall Burden.....	11
A.13. Estimates of other total annual cost burden to respondents and record keepers.....	15
A.14. Annualized cost to federal government.....	15
A.15. Explanation for program changes or adjustments.....	15
A.16. Plans for tabulation and publication and project time schedule.....	15
1. Analysis Plan.....	15
2. Time Schedule and Publications.....	16
A.17. Reason(s) display of OMB expiration date is inappropriate.....	16
A.18. Exceptions to certification for Paperwork Reduction Act submissions.....	16
REFERENCES.....	17

TABLES

Table A.1: PREP Evaluation Components.....	2
Table A.2: Implementation Survey Instruments.....	3
Table A.3: Implementation Study Semi-Structured Interview Topics by Respondent Type.....	6
Table A.4: Estimate of the Burden and Cost for the Grantees and Implementation Sites for Implementation Study Data Collection.....	11
Table A.5: Estimate of Burden and Cost for the PREP Evaluation – Approved and Requested Burden.....	12
Table A.6: Schedule for the Implementation Survey.....	16

ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT A: 60 DAY FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE.....	A.1
ATTACHMENT B: PREP EVALUATION DESCRIPTION.....	B.1

INSTRUMENTS

- INSTRUMENT #1: PARTICIPANT ENTRY SURVEY
 - INSTRUMENT #2: PARTICIPANT EXIT SURVEY
 - INSTRUMENT #3: PERFORMANCE REPORTING DATA SYSTEM ENTRY FORM
 - INSTRUMENT #4: SUB-AWARDEE DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING FORM
-

PART A: JUSTIFICATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION DATA COLLECTION

The Family and Youth Services Bureau and the Office of Planning (FYB), Research and Evaluation (OPRE) within the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) have contracted with Mathematica Policy Research and its subcontractors to conduct the Personal Responsibility Education Program Multi-Component Evaluation. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the implementation, outcomes, and impact of programs implemented as part of the Personal Responsibility Education Program (PREP). This package requests clearance for a second round of data collection conducted for the evaluation's Design and Implementation Study (DIS). For more information on data collection related to previously approved activities, see Information Collection Requests (ICRs) under OMB Control # 0970-0398.

A1. Circumstances making the collection of information necessary

1. The Personal Responsibility Education Program (PREP)

On March 23, 2010 the President signed into law the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA), H.R. 3590 (Public Law 111-148, Section 2953), which authorized the Personal Responsibility Education Program (PREP). PREP provides grants to states, tribes, tribal communities, and local organizations to support evidence-based programs to reduce teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections (STIs). The programs are required to provide education on both abstinence and contraceptive use. The programs will also offer information on adulthood preparation subjects such as healthy relationships, adolescent development, financial literacy, parent-child communication, education and employment skills, and healthy life skills. Grantees are encouraged to target their programming to high-risk populations—for example, homeless youth, youth in foster care, pregnant or parenting teens, youth residing in geographic areas with high teen birth rates, and Native American youth. States and territories acquire PREP funding through formula grants (state PREP), and local organizations and tribes obtain it via a competitive grant process (Competitive PREP and Tribal PREP). The program is administered by the Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB), within the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

2. The PREP Evaluation

As part of ACA, Congress mandated a federal evaluation of the PREP program. To meet this need, FYSB and the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE) within ACF have contracted with Mathematica Policy Research and its subcontractors (“the study team”) to conduct the PREP Multi-Component Evaluation (the PREP Evaluation), a seven year evaluation to document how PREP-funded programs are operationalized in the field, collect and analyze performance measure data from PREP grantees, and assess the effectiveness of selected PREP-funded programs on reducing teenage pregnancies, sexual risk behaviors, and STIs. The PREP Evaluation contains three complementary components. The purposes and objectives of each component are described in Table A.1.

Table A.1. PREP Evaluation Components

Evaluation Component	Purpose and Objectives
Design and Implementation Study	<p><i>Overall</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide a broad descriptive analysis of how states are using PREP grant funding to develop and support evidence-based teen pregnancy and STI prevention programs. <p><i>Design Survey</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct telephone interviews with all PREP state grantees prior to or at the start of program implementation. - Describe states' plans to implement evidence-based programming under PREP, including the reasons why key program design decisions were made and states' goals for program implementation. <p><i>Implementation Survey</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct semi-structured telephone interviews with multiple respondents in four states one year into implementation to examine the structures in place to support evidence-based PREP programs. - Develop a detailed description of four states' efforts to support the implementation of evidence-based programs with quality and fidelity.
Performance Analysis Study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop PREP program performance measures. - Collect and analyze program performance measures from all PREP grantees to understand whether program objectives are being met and whether technical assistance is needed to support program improvement.
Impact and In-Depth Implementation Study	<p><i>Overall</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assess the impacts and implementation of funded programs in four selected PREP sites. <p><i>Impact Study</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Determine whether the selected PREP-funded programs are effective at reducing teen pregnancy, STIs, and sexual risk behaviors. - Provide sound, scientific evidence about program effectiveness within the context of this large-scale replication effort. <p><i>Implementation Study</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify factors that affect large-scale replication of the selected program models. - Assess the quality of delivery and fidelity to the selected program models.

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has previously approved four information collection requests (ICRs) related to the PREP Evaluation:

- November 6, 2011: OMB approved “Field Data Collection” as part of the Impact and In-Depth Implementation Study, which involved collecting data on various program models and assessing the feasibility of conducting a rigorous evaluation (OMB Control # 0970-0398).
- March 7, 2012: OMB approved the “Design Survey” conducted as part of the Design and Implementation Study, which involved interviewing state administrators about key decisions they made about the design of their PREP programs (OMB Control #0970-0398).
- March 12, 2013: OMB approved the instruments associated with two data collection efforts: (1) collection of PREP performance measures from state and tribal PREP grantees for the

Performance Analysis Study through participant entry and exit surveys and the Performance Reporting System Data Entry; and (2) collection of baseline data for the Impact and In-Depth Implementation Study through a baseline survey (OMB Control # 0970-0398).

- November 8, 2013: OMB approved (1) the data collections associated with the Performance Analysis Study for CPREP grantees and for (2) the collection of youth follow-up data, staff interviews, a staff survey, and youth focus groups under the Impact and In-Depth Implementation Study (OMB Control # 0970-0398).

3. The Design and Implementation Study (DIS) - Implementation Survey

In this submission, ACF requests OMB approval for an instrument used to collect data for the Implementation Survey phase of the PREP Evaluation's DIS component. The Design Survey phase of the DIS component was implemented across all State PREP grantees. The Implementation Survey phase of the DIS will provide a detailed description of how a sub-set of four states have created structures and supports to assist program providers in implementing evidence-based programs with quality and fidelity to their designs. During the Design Survey interviews, nearly all PREP grantees identified maintaining program fidelity as one of their primary objectives, and nearly all grantees reported plans to support training, technical assistance, and monitor program implementation (Zief et. al.). The Implementation Survey will examine (a) the different structures and practices that states have put in place to support the successful implementation of evidence-based programs with fidelity, (b) the extent to which the structures and practices may vary within different state contexts, and (c) lessons learned from supporting state-wide program implementation.

The instrument used to conduct Implementation Survey data collection—Implementation Survey Interview Topic Guide (Instrument 1)—is attached to this submission. Also attached are the 60 Day Federal Register Notice request for comments on Implementation Survey data collection (Attachment A), a summary of the PREP evaluation (Attachment B), and the e-email that will be used to introduce the survey to respondents and to schedule interviews (Attachment C).

A.2. Purpose and use of the information collected

To achieve the Implementation Survey goals, the study team will conduct semi-structured telephone interviews with staff involved in PREP program implementation at multiple levels within four states. Based on program structure and staffing information collected during Design Survey interviews, we expect that interview respondents will include:

- **State grantee lead staff.** State PREP funds are provided to a state agency, such as a department of health. Interviews with these state agency administrators will focus on the states' overall goals and plans for assuring and maintaining program quality and fidelity across providers, and the state's role in administering and/or overseeing these activities.
- **Training and technical assistance staff.** During Design Survey interviews, states indicated that they either directly provide training and technical assistance to program providers, or that they contract with another organization (or organizations) to do so. Be they state or sub-contractor employees, the study team will interview these staff about the

goals and activities of training and technical assistance for PREP programs across the state.

- **Evaluators.** As with training and technical assistance, states either evaluate their PREP programs or contract with an outside organization to do so. Interviews with these respondents will focus on how the state and its program providers use evaluation data for program monitoring and continuous improvement purposes.
- **Program providers.** The study team will speak with key staff among program providers to learn about staffing and organizational details that support PREP implementation as well as the use of and perceived effectiveness of the implementation structures and supports that are in place for the PREP program in the state.

Speaking with respondents from across these groups will ensure that the data collected represent the range of perspectives and positions involved in supporting implementation quality and fidelity. Further, it will ensure that the study team understands not only how service delivery and administrative processes are *intended to work*, but also how they **actually** work.

We anticipate that the study team will interview an average of 8 respondents per state, for a total of 32 respondents across the 4 selected states. While the specific respondents in each state will likely vary, we expect that among these eight respondents per state will be four state-level staff—one state grantee respondent, two training and technical assistance respondents, and one evaluator respondent—and one manager from each of four program providers from within the state.

The study team will use the Implementation Survey Interview Topic Guide (attached Instrument 1) to guide the Implementation Survey interviews. The Topic Guide is informed by the principles of implementation science. Implementation science is the study of how evidence-based or evidence-informed programs and practices are translated, replicated, and scaled up in diverse, “real world” service delivery settings. The Topic Guide is structured largely on the definitions and elements of implementation stages and implementation drivers, as laid out by the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN). The NIRN has reviewed and summarized findings from a large body of literature on implementation to identify the practices and supports that are common among successfully implemented programs or interventions that produce their intended outcomes. The Topic Guide is organized into eight constructs:

1. **PREP Implementation Structure and Planning.** The Design Survey captured information about the initial design and implementation plans for all the PREP grantees. The objective for the Implementation Survey is to understand how the implementation structure may have changed in the four study states and why, as well as lessons learned about the implementation structure that could inform future initiatives to provide evidence-based programs state-wide. Questions in this construct will also gather information on the means for and perceived success in assessing the PREP model fit for program providers, and the readiness of provider organizations, their partners, and communities to support the PREP program.
2. **Implementation Support: Training and Technical Assistance.** Questions in this construct will focus first on capturing details of the implementation support structure and adequacy of funding for supports within each of the four states. The questions will

then delve into the timing, content, modes, and frequency of training and technical assistance to support the PREP program. Additionally, questions will gather information on how training and technical assistance needs are identified and initiated, and what follow-up occurs to further refine implementation and decision-making.

3. **Implementation Drivers: Staff Competency Drivers.** While training and technical assistance build and support staff capacity to deliver evidence-based programs as intended, additional drivers that are specific to the implementation staff themselves also contribute to the competency with which a program is implemented. Questions in this construct will examine criteria and process for staff selection, the degree of staff turnover or retention and strategies to support consistency in staff for service delivery, the means through which program expectations are communicated to staff and staff receptiveness to the program, and, lastly the means, focus, and frequency of staff supervision and performance assessment.
4. **Implementation Drivers: Organization Drivers.** The capacity and support that exists within each organization for the program also contributes to the quality and fidelity with which the program can be implemented. Questions in this construct will examine: (1) decision support data systems—what data are collected, with what quality assurances, and how the data are used in implementation; (2) the degree of facilitative administration—what organization leaders are willing to do or change to support implementation; (3) communication and feedback loops that involve all levels of staff and the range of organizational partners in implementation refinement and decision-making; and, (4) strategies, successes, and challenges in systems interventions—how partners, communities, and other service systems are brought on board to support implementation and how responsive they are to changes that support implementation.
5. **Fidelity Assessment and Monitoring.** While PREP grantees are not held to specific benchmarks in maintaining fidelity, the majority of state grantees indicated that fidelity monitoring would be an important emphasis in their programs. Questions will focus on the means through which expectations about adherence to the service model are communicated to programs and staff, and means, focus, and frequency of monitoring service delivery, and the adaptations that have been made to PREP programs and why.
6. **Evaluation Capacity.** Questions in this construct will gather information about the evaluation capacity in each of the four states, as well as how information from evaluation is communicated and used to inform PREP implementation. They will also assess the type and frequency of PREP program evaluations, and ask about key findings from completed program evaluations (if available) and the extent to which state grantees use evaluation results to improve program models.
7. **Sustainability.** Questions in this construct will examine the extent to which plans are underway to preserve the service delivery and funding structures to continue the PREP program and whether these pursuits are coordinated across implementation partners.
8. **Perceptions and Lessons Learned about PREP Implementation.** The Implementation Survey will end with a number of summary questions to ensure that the perspectives of each respondent on the successes and challenges in implementing PREP and the effectiveness of the support structures are gathered.

The specific questions asked by the study team during the semi-structured interviews will vary by respondent type, but all questions will remain within the scope of the constructs discussed above and detailed in attached Instrument 1: Implementation Survey Interview Topic Guide. Each interview will last for an average of one hour.

Table A.2. Implementation Study Semi-Structured Interview Topics by Respondent Type

	State grantee lead staff	Training and technical assistance provider staff	Evaluator staff	Program provider managers
Implementation Structure and Planning				
Implementation structure	✓			✓
Model fit for service providers	✓			✓
Lessons from PREP planning	✓			✓
Implementation Support: Training and Technical Assistance (TA)				
Implementation support structure	✓	✓	✓	✓
Funding for training and TA	✓	✓		✓
Training to support PREP implementation	✓	✓		✓
Ongoing support and TA	✓	✓		✓
Implementation Drivers: Competency Drivers				
Staff selection	✓	✓		✓
Staff turnover and retention	✓	✓		✓
Staff expectations and receptiveness	✓	✓		✓
Staff supervision and performance assessment				✓
Implementation Drivers: Organizational Drivers				
Decision-support data systems	✓	✓		✓
Facilitative administration	✓	✓		✓
Communication and feedback loops	✓	✓		✓
Systems interventions	✓	✓	✓	✓
Fidelity Assessment and Monitoring				
Program modifications or adaptations	✓	✓		✓
Adherence to service model	✓	✓		✓
Monitoring service delivery	✓	✓	✓	✓
Evaluation Capacity				
Evaluation capacity	✓		✓	
Sustainability				
Sustainability	✓	✓		✓
Perceptions and Lessons Learned about PREP Implementation				
Perceptions and lessons learned	✓	✓	✓	✓

A.3. Use of information technology to reduce burden

The Implementation Survey is not conducive to the use of information technology.

A.4. Efforts to identify duplication and use of similar information

We have carefully reviewed the information collection requirements for PREP to avoid duplication with either existing studies or other ongoing federal teen pregnancy prevention evaluations and believe that the PREP Evaluation complements, but does not duplicate, the existing literature and other ongoing federal teen pregnancy prevention evaluations.

There are three other federal teen pregnancy prevention-related evaluations currently in the field, each with a very specific focus. They are: (1) the Evaluation of Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Approaches, sponsored by the Office of Adolescent Health within HHS, which focuses on testing promising and innovative new models for reducing teen pregnancy (OMB Control # 0970-0360); (2) the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Replication Study, also sponsored by the Office of Adolescent Health within HHS, which focuses on the testing of evidence-based models for reducing teen pregnancy (which are being scaled up through the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program administered by the HHS Office of Adolescent Health) (OMB Control # 0990-0375); and (3) the Community-Wide Initiatives Study (OMB Control # 0920-0952), sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, which focuses on testing community saturation models for reducing teen pregnancy.

We believe that the PREP Evaluation complements these other evaluations by adding much-needed information on the replication of evidence-based programs, with particular emphasis on (1) replication among high-risk populations and in new settings and (2) how states and localities choose and implement evidence-based programs most appropriate for their local contexts. Further, the evaluation provides a unique opportunity to document and test adaptations to existing evidence-based program models—for example, through the incorporation of adulthood preparation education or through the natural adaptation that will arise as states choose and implement programs in different ways. Finally, the evaluation will offer lessons on the successes and challenges in scaling up and disseminating evidence-based programming on a very broad scale, with implications not only for the field of teen pregnancy prevention research but also for other areas of social services research.

The Implementation Survey phase of the PREP Evaluation's Design and Implementation Study component will provide policymakers and practitioners with critical information about approaches to supporting and maintaining high-quality implementation of evidence-based programs. This is not currently being assessed as part of the three evaluations mentioned above or through any of the other components of the PREP Evaluation. The Implementation Study phase of the ongoing Impact and In-Depth Implementation Study component of the PREP Evaluation is targeted toward understanding implementation of and fidelity to a specific PREP model within each of four states that are the focus of the Impact Study phase. The Implementation Survey differs from this work in that the survey is focused on understanding the state infrastructure to support implementation quality and fidelity for a variety of program models within each selected state (not the specific implementation of one model). The study team does not plan to select any states for the Implementation Survey that are participating in the Impact and In-Depth Implementation Study; however, if one of these states helps us to achieve important variation along one of the key dimensions of state selection, the study team might invite the state to participate in the Implementation Survey. Should this unlikely scenario arise, the study team will make every effort not to interview the same state-level respondents who are

interviewed for the Impact and In-Depth Implementation Study. Further, the study team will ensure that program providers that are already involved in the In-Depth Implementation Study will not also be selected for the Implementation Survey in order to minimize the burden placed on them.

The study team will make use of extant data collected through multiple PREP evaluation components to reduce respondent burden on the Implementation Survey. Prior to conducting the interviews, the study team will review (a) data collected from state PREP grantees during the Design Survey phase of the DIS Study (including grantee information from state's applications for PREP funds and Design Survey interview responses), and (b) performance measures data collected for the Performance Analysis Study. The study team will customize Implementation Survey topic guides to ensure that they only ask for information not already collected for the evaluation, or that is not otherwise available from public sources. Respondents will only be asked those questions relevant to their role in PREP program quality assurance, monitoring, evaluation, and technical assistance to PREP providers. No respondent will be asked the same question more than once.

A.5. Impact on small businesses

PREP program providers in some states may be small, community-based organizations. We will minimize burden on such sites by requesting an interview of just one respondent, conducting the interview over the phone, and ensuring that the interview can be completed in one hour or less.

A.6. Consequences of not collecting the information/collecting less frequently

Implementation Survey data will be collected only once. These data are essential for developing an in-depth understanding of how states support and monitor evidence-based programs to ensure that they are implemented with quality and fidelity. Not collecting these data would make it impossible to accurately understand and assess states' quality assurance structures. The lessons learned from this data collection effort can inform the structures and supports needed to support large-scale, successful implementation of evidence-based programs. No other component of the PREP evaluation will provide such evidence.

A.7. Special circumstances

There are no special circumstances for the proposed data collection efforts.

A.8. *Federal Register* notice and consultation outside the agency

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13) and OMB regulations at 5 CFR Part 1320 (60 FR 44978, August 29, 1995), ACF published a notice in the *Federal Register* announcing the agency's intention to request an OMB review of this information collection activity. This notice was published on October 22, 2013, Volume 78, Number 204, pages 62637-62638 and provided a 60-day period for public comment. During the notice and comment period, no comments were received. A copy of the 60-day FRN is included as Attachment A.

The names and contact information of the persons consulted in the drafting and refinement of the interview topic guide and analysis plan for the Implementation Survey are:

Clare DiSalvo
Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human
Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW
7th Floor West
Washington, DC 20447
(202) 401-4537

Dirk Butler
Family and Youth Services Bureau
Division of Abstinence Education
U.S. Department of Health and Human
Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW
Washington, DC 20477
(202) 260-2242

Robert Wood
Mathematica Policy Research
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 084543-2393
(609) 936-2776

Susan Zief
Mathematica Policy Research
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 084543-2393
(609) 275-2291

Gretchen Kirby
Mathematica Policy Research
1100 1st Street, NE, 12th Floor
Washington, DC 20002-4221
(202) 484-3470

Diane Paulsell
Mathematica Policy Research
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 084543-2393
(609) 275-2297

Jessica Ziegler
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
955 Massachusetts Ave., Suite 801
Cambridge, MA 02139
(617) 715-9939

A.9. Payments to respondents

No payments to respondents are proposed for this information collection.

A.10. Assurances of confidentiality

The Implementation Survey will not collect or report any personally identifiable information. Nonetheless, the study team will adhere to a set of strict standards to ensure that data and respondent privacy are protected. Respondents will receive information about privacy protection when arrangements are made for speaking with them, and information about privacy will be repeated as part of the study team's introductory comments during interviews. The study team will be informed about privacy procedures during training and will be prepared to describe them and to answer questions raised by respondents.

The study team will ensure respondent privacy in all Implementation Survey publications. An Implementation Survey report will summarize the commonalities and differences in how the

four states approach program fidelity and quality monitoring and technical assistance. The report will primarily describe themes emerging across the states, without naming particular states, programs, or people. However, when necessary to convey a key point or finding, the report will highlight examples from individual states and sites. The state and sites included in these examples will only be identified by name when the example discusses a best practice, and the study team will obtain their approval of all such references. The report will also contain brief summaries of each state's implementation support and monitoring approach that will identify states by name. These summaries will only include facts about program monitoring and support, will not impart respondent or study team opinions, and will not compare states to one another.

Individual interview respondents will not be identified by name in any Implementation Survey publications. They will be notified of the reporting approaches discussed above as part of the privacy information provided by the study team prior to interviews (see the introduction of attached Instrument 1: Implementation Survey Interview Topic Guide).

A.11. Justification for Sensitive Questions

The Implementation Survey Interview Topic Guide does not contain topics of a sensitive or personal nature. No personal information will be requested from respondents interviewed for the Implementation Survey. The interviews will focus on respondents' knowledge, experiences, and role in PREP program monitoring and technical assistance. Nonetheless, respondents will be informed that they do not have to respond to any questions that they do not feel comfortable answering (see the introduction of attached Instrument 1: Implementation Survey Interview Topic Guide).

A.12. Estimates of the burden of data collection

1. Estimate of Annual Burden – Current ICR (November 2014)

The annual estimated hours of burden for the data collection included in this August 2014 request for Implementation Survey data collection is about 12 hours (see Table A.3), which equals the sum of the estimated annual burden for all semi-structured telephone interviews across 32 state-level and provider-level respondents. Each interview is expected to last one-hour.

2. Estimates of Annual Costs – Current ICR (November 2014)

The annual estimated cost to respondents for the Implementation Survey data collection is \$361.08 (see Table A.3). The total annual cost for state-level interview respondents is \$232.08 (6 annual hours * \$38.68). This hourly wage rate represents the mean hourly wage rate for social scientists and related workers (National Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, May 2013). The total annual cost for provider-level respondents is \$129.00 (6 annual hours * \$21.50). This hourly wage rate represents the mean hourly wage rate for community and social service occupations (National Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, May 2013).

Table A.3. Estimate of the Burden and Cost for the Grantees and Implementation Sites for Implementation Study Data Collection

	Total Number of Respondents	Annual Number of Respondents ^a	Number of Responses per Respondent	Average Burden Hours per Response	Total Annual Burden Hours ^a	Average Hourly Wage	Total Annualized Cost ^a
State-level Respondents	16	6	1	1	6	\$38.68	\$232.08
Provider-level Respondents	16	6	1	1	6	\$21.50	\$129.00
Total:					12		\$361.08

^aAll burden estimates are annualized over three years.

3. Overall Burden under OMB #0970-0398 (Revised July 2016)

ACF is currently requesting approval to increase the number of respondents to information collections (ICs) for the PREP Performance Analysis Study (PAS), which collects and analyzes program performance measures from all PREP grantees to understand whether program objectives are being met and whether technical assistance is needed to support program improvement. Through the PAS, grantees submit data annually on two broad topics – PREP program structure and PREP program delivery.

The number of youth respondents expected between fall 2016 – fall 2017 exceeds our original estimates. As a result, we need to increase the number of respondents to approved information collections (ICs) for two cohorts of PREP grantees: State and Competitive: The burden increase for State PREP is for the following instruments: (1) Participant Entry Survey; (2) Participant Exit Survey; and (3) Sub awardee Data Collection and Reporting Form. The burden increase for CPREP is for the following instruments: (1) Participant Entry Survey; and (2) Participant Exit Survey.

The number of CPREP grantees responding to the Performance Reporting System Data Entry form has declined from 37 to 20. We have updated the burden table to reflect that decrease in burden.

The content of the ICs and the average burden per response remains the same under this July 2016 submission..

Estimated number of respondents

ACF originally estimated the number of annual respondents using two sources: (1) grant applications, in which grantees projected the reach of their programs, and (2) interviews with grantees during their planning year. State PREP and Competitive PREP (CPREP) grantees have incrementally increased the reach of their programs in a way that they had not anticipated as they were first designing and launching their programs - by about five percent each year. State PREP grantees also have made more sub-awards to program providers than originally estimated. The number of State PREP grantee administrators has remained stable throughout the funding period; the number of CPREP grantees has declined from 37 to 20.

Table A.4 details the overall burden approved and requested for data collection associated with the PREP Multi-Component Evaluation. A total of 36,943 annual burden hours (at an annualized cost of \$463,824) has been approved thus far with the prior ICRs for this project. If approved, the total annual approved burden for this project (i.e. the prior annual burden summed with the requested annual burden) will be 46,268 hours (at an annualized cost of \$487,760.26). Note: Some of data collection for the instruments below is complete, while other instruments are still being used in the field. Please see Table A.4 for specific details regarding instruments that are no longer being used vs. those that are still in use to date.

Table A.4. Estimate of Burden and Cost for the PREP Evaluation – Approved and Requested Burden

Data Collection Instrument	Type of Respondent	Total Number of Respondents	Number of Responses per Respondent ^a	Average Burden Hours per Response	Total Burden Hours	Annual Burden Hours	Annual Burden Hours for Age 18 or Older	Hourly Wage Rate	Total Annualized Cost
Field Data Collection for Impact and In-Depth Implementation Study (Approved November 6, 2011; Data Collection Completed)									
Discussion Guide for use with Macro-Level Coordinators	Macro-Level Coordinators	30	1	1	30	10	N/A	\$33.59	\$333.90
Discussion Guide for use with Program Directors	Program Directors	60	2	2	240	80	N/A	\$27.21	\$2,176.80
Discussion Guide for Use with Program Staff	Program Staff	120	1	2	240	80	N/A	\$23.76	\$1,900.80
Discussion Guide for Use with School Administrators	School Administrators	210	1	1	210	70	N/A	\$35.54	\$2,487.80
Design and Implementation Study (Approved March 7, 2012; Data Collection Completed)									
Design Survey: Discussion Guide for Use with PREP State-Level Coordinators and State-Level Staff	State-Level Coordinators and State-Level Staff	90 ^a	1	1	90	30	N/A	\$37.45	\$1,123.50
Performance Analysis Study and Baseline Data (Approved March 12, 2013; Instruments Still in Use)									
Participant Entry Survey	PREP State and Tribal Participants	174,105	1	0.08333	14,508	4,836	1,209	\$7.25	\$8,765.25
Participant Exit Survey	PREP State and Tribal Participants	226,515	1	0.16667	37,753	12,584	1,258.4	\$7.25	\$9,123.40

Data Collection Instrument	Type of Respondent	Total Number of Respondents	Number of Responses per Respondent ^a	Average Burden Hours per Response	Total Burden Hours	Annual Burden Hours	Annual Burden Hours for Age 18 or Older	Hourly Wage Rate	Total Annualized Cost
Baseline Survey	PREP State and Tribal Participants	5,700	1	0.75	4,275	1,425	143	\$7.25	\$1,037.00
Performance Reporting System Data Entry Form	PREP State and Tribal Grantee Administrators	195	1	24	4,680	1,560	N/A	\$21.35	\$33,306.00
Sub-awardee Data Collection and Reporting	PREP State and Tribal Sub-Awardee Administrators	1,200	1	18.6667	22,401	7,467	N/A	\$20.76	\$155,014.92
Implementation Site Data Collection	PREP State and Tribal Site Facilitator	4,200	1	8	33,600	11,200	N/A	\$20.76	\$232,512.00
Impact and In-Depth Implementation Study and Performance Analysis Study (Approved November 8, 2013; Instruments Still in Use)									
Participant Entry Survey	CPREP Participants	29,310	1	0.08333	2,422	814	203.5	\$7.25	\$1,478.38
Participant Exit Survey	CPREP Participants	44,899	1	0.16667	7,482	2,494	249.4	\$7.25	\$1,808.15
Performance Reporting Data System Entry Form	CPREP Grantees	20	2	19	760	253	N/A	\$20.76	\$5,252.28
Implementation Site Data Collection Protocol	CPREP Implementation Sites	300	2	6	3,600	1,200	N/A	\$20.76	\$24,912
First Follow-Up Survey	Participants	4,800	1	0.75	3,600	1,200	120	\$7.25	\$870.00
Second Follow-Up Survey	Participants	2,250	1	0.75	1,688	563	56	\$7.25	\$406.00
Focus Group Discussion Guide	Participants	320	1	1.5	480	160	16	\$7.25	\$117.00

Data Collection Instrument	Type of Respondent	Total Number of Respondents	Number of Responses per Respondent ^a	Average Burden Hours per Response	Total Burden Hours	Annual Burden Hours	Annual Burden Hours for Age 18 or Older	Hourly Wage Rate	Total Annualized Cost
Master List of Topics for Staff Interviews	State, Grantee, Subawardee and Implementation on Site Staff	160	2	1	320	107	N/A	\$20.76	\$2,221.00
Staff Survey	Implementation on Site Staff	100	2	0.5	100	33	N/A	\$20.76	\$685.00
Program Attendance	Implementation on Site Staff	90	12	0.25	270	90	N/A	\$20.76	\$1,868.00
Design and Implementation Study (Approved November 17, 2014; Instruments still in use)									
Implementation Survey Interview Topic Guide	State level Respondents	16	1	1	16	6	N/A	\$38.68	\$232.08
Implementation Survey Interview Topic Guide	Provider-level Respondents	16	1	1	16	6	N/A	\$21.50	\$129.00
Total: Annual Burden - Approved To-Date and Requested						46,268			\$487,760.26

^aNumber of responses over the three year period.

A13. Estimates of other total annual cost burden to respondents and record keepers

These information collection activities do not place any capital cost or cost of maintaining requirements on respondents.

A.14. Annualized cost to federal government

The estimated total cost for completion of the PREP Evaluation—across all data collection activities—is \$7,935,964, which is an annualized cost of \$2,645,321. This includes the total estimated cost for completion of the Implementation Survey phase of the DIS, which is \$400,000 or \$133,333 per year annualized across three years. PREP Evaluation costs include OMB applications; development of data collection instruments; data collection; data analysis; and reporting.

A.15. Explanation for program changes or adjustments

OMB has previously approved four ICRs related to the PREP Evaluation and under OMB Control # 0970-0398, listed above is section **A.1. Circumstances making the collection of information necessary**. This request will increase the total burden requested for the PREP Evaluation, under OMB Control No. 0970-0398.

A16. Plans for tabulation and publication and project time schedule

This section details the analysis plan and time schedule and publications related to the Implementation Survey phase of the DIS. For information related to previously approved activities, see ICRs under OMB #0970-0398.

1. Analysis Plan

The Implementation Survey will use the information collected from across respondents to conduct an in-depth analysis of how states support the PREP program to promote quality and fidelity in implementation. The analysis plan consists of three steps: (1) code the qualitative interview data; (2) organize results in a series of tables for further synthesis, and (3) identify themes in the data within and across states and program providers.

Code the qualitative data. First, the study team will create a coding scheme that closely follows the seven constructs of the protocols and the subtopics contained within each of them. The study team will then use a qualitative software package (NVivo or Atlas.ti) to assign codes to each question response in the electronic files of interview notes. Coding the qualitative data in this way will enable the team to access data on a specific topic quickly and to organize information in different ways to facilitate the identification of themes and compile the evidence supporting them. For thematic data, such as perceptions of structures, successes, and challenges, the coding scheme will be refined to better align it with both themes and topics that emerge from the data and with the research questions (Ritchie and Spencer, 2002).

Organize results in a series of tables. Next, study team will organize key descriptive data—such as information on program implementation structure (e.g., program model), support structure (e.g., training frequency, duration, and topics), and staff qualifications, etc.—into

tables. This will ensure that data about program implementation and support is documented in a standardized way that allows for systematic analysis across sites.

Identify themes and patterns in the data. After all the data have been coded and organized, the study team will use the software to retrieve data on the research questions and subtopics to identify themes and triangulate across data sources and individual respondents. Much of the meaning of the data will be discerned through qualitative descriptive analyses that organize data thematically, and that examine themes and topics from multiple perspectives and highlight the similarities and differences among them (Patton, 2002). The study team will also explore relationships across themes (for example, relationships between the types of implementation challenges sites face and their staffing patterns and partnership arrangements).

2. Time Schedule and Publications

Findings from the Implementation Survey will be presented in a report that summarizes the commonalities and differences in how the survey states approach program fidelity and quality monitoring and technical assistance, and that contains brief profiles of each state's implementation support and monitoring approach. Table A.5 shows the schedule for the Implementation Survey.

Table A.5. Schedule for the Implementation Survey

Activity	Date
Conduct telephone interviews	Fall 2014 – Winter 2015
Analysis	Spring 2015
Reporting	Summer 2015

A17. Reason(s) display of OMB expiration date is inappropriate

The OMB approval number and expiration date will be displayed or cited on all instruments and forms completed as part of the data collection.

A18. Exceptions to certification for Paperwork Reduction Act submissions

No exceptions are necessary for this information collection.

REFERENCES

National Implementation Research Network (NIRN). FPG Child Development Institute, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. *Research and Resources*. Retrieved from <http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/resource-search> on 9 June 2014.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Third edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ritchie, J., and Spencer, L. (2002). *Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research*. In Huberman, A.M., and Miles, M.B. *The qualitative researcher's companion*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zief, Susan, Rachel Shapiro, and Debra Strong. "The Personal Responsibility Education Program: Launching a Nationwide Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Effort. Final Report." Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, October 2013.