

Part A: Supporting Statement for Paperwork Reduction Act Submission

Migrant and Seasonal Head Start Study

New Collection

August 2016

Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
330 C Street, SW
Washington, DC 20201

Project Officer:

Wendy DeCoursey

CONTENTS

A.	JUSTIFICATION.....	1
A.1.	Circumstances Making the Information Collection Necessary.....	1
A.1.1.	Background.....	1
A.1.2.	Overview of the Study.....	3
A.2.	Purpose and Use of the Information Collection.....	7
A.2.1.	Program and Center Component.....	9
A.2.2.	Classroom, Family and Child Component.....	9
A.3.	Use of Improved Information Technology to Reduce Burden.....	11
A.4.	Efforts to Identify Duplication and Use of Similar Information.....	12
A.5.	Impact on Small Businesses or Other Small Entities.....	13
A.6.	Consequences of Not Collecting Information or Collecting Information Less Frequently.....	13
A.7.	Special Circumstances Relating to the Guidelines of 5 CFR 1320.5.....	13
A.8.	Comments in Response to the Federal Register Notice and Efforts to Consult Outside the Agency.....	14
A.8.1.	Federal Register Notice and Comments.....	14
A.8.2.	Consultation with Experts Outside of the Study.....	14
A.9.	Explanation of Any Incentive for Respondents.....	14
A.10.	Assurance of Privacy Provided to Respondents.....	15
A.11.	Justification for Sensitive Questions.....	16
A.12.	Estimates of Annualized Burden Hours and Costs.....	16
A.13.	Estimates of Other Total Cost Burden to Respondents and Record Keepers.....	19
A.14.	Cost to the Federal Government.....	19
A.15.	Explanation for Program Changes or Adjustments.....	19
A.16.	Plans for Tabulation and Publication and Project Time Schedule.....	19
A.16.1.	Analysis Plan.....	19
A.16.2.	Time Schedule and Publications.....	21
A.17.	Reason(s) Display of OMB Expiration Date Is Inappropriate.....	21
A.18.	Exceptions to Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions.....	21

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1. Conceptual Framework for MSHS Study
- Appendix 2. Recruitment Letters to Accompany Program and Center Director Mail Surveys
- Appendix 3. Program Director Survey
- Appendix 4. Center Director Survey
- Appendix 5. Follow-Up Reminders for Program and Center Director Non-Responders
- Appendix 6. Recruitment Email from ACF for Program Directors for Onsite Data Collection
- Appendix 7. Recruitment Email from Study Team for Program Director for Onsite Data Collection
- Appendix 8. FAQs for Program and Center Directors
- Appendix 9. Recruitment Flyer for Program and Center Directors
- Appendix 10. Form for Program Directors to Verify Selected Centers' Information
- Appendix 11. Telephone Script for Grantee/Delegate Agency Directors
- Appendix 12. Recruitment Email from Study Team for Center Director for Onsite Data Collection
- Appendix 13. Telephone Script for Center Directors for Onsite Data Collection
- Appendix 14. Recruitment Letter from Study Team for On Site Coordinators
- Appendix 15. Telephone Script for On Site Coordinators
- Appendix 16. Classroom Sampling Form
- Appendix 17. Child Roster Form
- Appendix 18. Teacher Survey
- Appendix 19. Assistant Teacher Survey
- Appendix 20. Recruitment Letter from Study Team for Teacher Packets
- Appendix 21. Recruitment Letter from ACF for Teacher Packets
- Appendix 22. Recruitment Flyer for Parents and Teachers
- Appendix 23. FAQs for Teachers and Assistant Teachers
- Appendix 24. Components of the Teacher Child Ratings
- Appendix 25. Recruitment Letter from Study Team for Parents
- Appendix 26. FAQs for Parents
- Appendix 27. Parent and Child Consent Form
- Appendix 28. Reminder Flyer for Parents and Teachers
- Appendix 29. Parent Interview
- Appendix 30. Components of the Parent Child Ratings
- Appendix 31. Components of the Classroom Observation
- Appendix 32. Data Collector Code of Conduct and Assurance of Confidentiality Agreement

Appendix 33. MSHS Study 60 Day FRN

Appendix 34. Components of the Child Assessment

Appendix 35. Data Collection Coordination Efforts for On Site Coordinators

EXHIBITS

Exhibit A.1. MSHS Instruments, Sample Size, and Type of Administration.....	5
Exhibit A.2. MSHS Study Timeline.....	6
Exhibit A.3. Recruitment Plan.....	7
Exhibit A.4. Data Collection Plan.....	8
Exhibit A.5. MSHS Expert Consultants.....	14
Exhibit A.6. MSHS Estimates of Annualized Burden Hours and Costs.....	18

A. JUSTIFICATION

The Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, is proposing to collect data for the Migrant and Seasonal Head Start (MSHS) Study. The MSHS Study is a nationally representative study that focuses on describing the characteristics and experiences of the children and families who enroll in MSHS and the practices and services of the MSHS programs that serve them. This information collection request is for the recruitment and data collection activities for the MSHS study.

A.1. Circumstances Making the Information Collection Necessary

A.1.1. Background

Head Start, founded in 1965, is a national comprehensive child development program serving low-income families and their children from birth to school entry. In 1969, Congress created the Indian and Migrant Programs Division, which would pave the way for what is now the MSHS program, Region XII, within the Office of Head Start (OHS). The MSHS program now serves over 30,000 culturally and linguistically diverse migrant and seasonal farmworker families and their children annually,¹ and is therefore an important part of the overall Head Start program. In fall 2015, ACF contracted with Abt Associates and its subcontractors, The Catholic University of America and Westat (together, the “study team”), under contract number HHSP233201500069I, to collect information on MSHS programs, centers, staff, families and children as part of the MSHS Study.

The regulations and program requirements outlined in The Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-134) provide a basis for the MSHS Study data collection. This Act outlines requirements for monitoring, research, and standards for Head Start, including specific requirements for MSHS programs. For example, the Act requires that OHS work to identify barriers that prevent eligible migrant and seasonal farmworker families from accessing Head Start services. Further, the Act outlines requirements for ensuring that programs receive sufficient training and technical assistance and that staff are adequately trained to support children’s learning through developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate approaches. The MSHS Study will collect data on a nationally representative sample of MSHS program and center directors, teachers and assistant teachers, children, and families served by MSHS in order to provide OHS, other federal government agencies, local programs, and the public with valid and reliable information.

The MSHS Study is also motivated by a critical need for research that can provide an updated and contemporary understanding of MSHS programs and the migrant and seasonal children and families they serve. Several characteristics of the MSHS program and its participant families make it challenging to study. For example, center opening and closing dates are dependent on weather patterns and are often tentative and vary from year to year. This makes the scheduling of data collection difficult. Also, since the vast majority of families served by the MSHS program speak Spanish as a first language, monolingual Spanish or bilingual Spanish-English assessments are imperative for this population. Indeed, for reasons such as these, MSHS programs have been not been

¹ National Head Start Association. (2016). *2015 Migrant Head Start Fact Sheet*. Retrieved from www.nhsa.org/fact-sheets

included in broader studies of Head Start and Early Head Start, such as the Family and Child Experiences Study (FACES) and Baby FACES. For a more thorough discussion of the contextual challenges to studying MSHS, see the Design for MSHS Study Report (2011).²

Despite the fact that MSHS has not been included in other national Head Start studies, OPRE has led an extended effort within the federal government to conduct research that lays the foundation for the current MSHS Study. In 2004, as a key step in preparing to implement an updated and expanded nationally representative study, ACF funded *The MSHS Research Design Development Project* (0970-0262). Using a small, geographically diverse sample, this project updated descriptive information from earlier work and contributed preliminary information about possible measures and methods for studying MSHS programs and families. In 2011, ACF published *The Design for Migrant and Seasonal Head Start Survey Report* (hereafter “The Design Report”), which included the development of a conceptual framework, research questions, and recommendations for sampling and measures for the MSHS Study.

The Design Report outlined a plan to generate descriptive information through a comprehensive data collection effort with a nationally representative sample of MSHS programs, centers, classrooms and children/families. To draw this nationally representative sample, the report proposed a multi-stage sampling design that could account for the unique characteristics of MSHS programs and centers (e.g., enrollment numbers may fluctuate in waves depending on the timing of crop cycles, and centers may vary in length, start date and end date). The Design Report also emphasized that inherent differences between the experiences of migrant and seasonal families and more traditional Head Start families, as well as the subsequent impact of these variations on the operation of local programs and centers, mean that the MSHS Study cannot simply replicate traditional Head Start research; it must acknowledge the differences between MSHS and regional Head Start and reflect these MSHS differences in sampling, measures, outreach to families and programs, data collection strategies, data analyses, and interpretation of findings.

Lastly, the MSHS study will provide essential information for local MSHS programs. The study comes at an important time for the MSHS program and for migrant and seasonal children and families. Significant changes in migration patterns, immigration policies, and climate conditions may be affecting these children and families in unknown ways and MSHS programs will benefit from an up-to-date understanding of the populations they serve. The study will also be the first national MSHS study to include direct child assessments, which will provide valuable information about MSHS children, which can be used to inform program, center and classroom practices.

² Administration for Children and Families (2011). *Design for Migrant and Seasonal Head Start Survey: Final Design Report*. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

A.1.2. Overview of the Study

The MSHS Study recruitment and data collection activities will yield rich information to answer the MSHS Study research questions, which were developed based on the MSHS Conceptual Framework (see Appendix 1). The overall goal of the MSHS study will be to: 1) describe the characteristics of MSHS programs, centers, families and children; 2) describe MSHS services, instructional practices and quality; and 3) understand the associations between MSHS characteristics and child/family well-being. The specific research questions addressed by the study are:

Characteristics of MSHS Programs, Centers, Families, and Children

1. What are the operational characteristics of MSHS programs and centers (e.g., location, program timing, outreach, staffing and leadership, salaries and benefits, community partnerships, communication across centers and programs)?
2. What are the characteristics of families participating in MSHS (e.g., demographics, agricultural livelihoods and mobility, social and economic challenges, cultural and linguistic processes)? What are the characteristics of *migrant* families participating in MSHS? What are the characteristics of *seasonal* families participating in MSHS?
3. What are the characteristics of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers enrolled in MSHS (e.g., demographics, health, languages)? What foundational skills for school success do MSHS children possess (with a special focus on language, emergent literacy, and social emotional skills)?

MSHS Services, Instructional Practices, and Quality

4. What services are MSHS programs and centers providing to support MSHS child development, as well as family well-being and engagement?
5. What are the service needs and preferences of MSHS families, as well as potential barriers to accessing services?
6. What are the instructional practices and general classroom quality of MSHS classrooms? Particularly, what instructional and assessment practices and policies are utilized to support children's language development, including bilingual language development?

Associations between MSHS Characteristics and Child/Family Well-being

7. How do families' service needs vary based on family characteristics (e.g., cultural, social, economic and migration-related experiences)?
8. How are MSHS services and resources related to family, staff, program and community characteristics?
9. How are family characteristics related to children's abilities?

To address these research questions the study will recruit and collect data for two distinct study components, each of which relies on a distinct sample.

First, for the **Program³ and Center Component**, the study will mail surveys to the universe of MSHS programs as well as to a nationally representative sample of centers. We propose to include all 53 MSHS programs, since the sample size is small and surveying all program directors will ensure that estimates of characteristics will have no sampling error. Additionally, a representative sample of center directors will be selected to receive a mail survey. To obtain precise center-level estimates, a sample of 200 centers is needed. The initial sample size will be randomly split into a main sample of 250 centers, which assumes an 80% response rate, and a reserve sample of 30 centers, which will be included if the response rate looks as if it will be lower than desired and additional sample is needed.⁴

Second, the **Classroom, Family and Child Component** will be based on a nationally representative sample of MSHS programs, centers, families and children. For this component, the study will recruit programs, centers, teachers and assistant teachers, and families/children into the sample. The Classroom, Family and Child Component will employ a multi-stage sampling design with four stages: 1) selection of grantees/delegate agencies; 2) selection of centers (sampled from each selected program); 3) selection of classrooms (sampled from each selected center); and 4) selection of children and their families (sampled from each selected classroom). To facilitate sampling and recruitment, the study team will collect information about classrooms and centers using the Classroom Sampling Form and Child Roster Forms (see Exhibit A.1).

Once centers and families have been recruited, we will schedule an on-site data collection visit, during which we will collect information from teachers (survey and Teacher Child Reports), assistant teachers (survey), children (child assessments), and parents (interview and Parent Child Reports). Assessors will also observe classrooms and collect Teacher and Parent Report data on toddlers and preschoolers. Exhibit A.1 presents a list of study instruments, including target sample sizes and type of administration. Ultimately, the MSHS sample will aim to include 1,018 children and their parents within 159 classrooms, 53 centers, and 24 programs. (Sampling procedures are described more fully in Section B.1 and data collection procedures more fully in Section B.2)

³ We use the term “program” as shorthand to represent both “grantees” and “delegate agencies.”

⁴ The probabilities of selection will be derived using a Keyfitz procedure to maximize the overlap with the 200 centers sampled for the Program and Center Component and the 53 centers sampled for the Classroom, Family, and Child Component. In other words, to ensure that the study team has data on all centers that are in the Classroom, Family and Child Component, any center directors within the Classroom, Family and Child Component sample who were not sampled for the Center Director mail survey in the Program and Center Component will be asked to complete the mail survey. For burden estimates (Part A), we assume the maximum possible number of respondents for the Center Director mailed survey (200 + 53 = 253).

Exhibit A.1. MSHS Instruments, Sample Size, and Type of Administration

	Instrument	Total Number of Targeted Respondents	Type of Administration
Program and Center Component	Program Director survey	53	Mail Survey (Paper-and-Pencil)
	Center Director survey	253 (200 + 53)	Mail Survey (Paper-and-Pencil)
Classroom, Family and Child Component	Form to Verify Selected Center Information	53	Electronic
	Classroom sampling form	53	Paper-and-Pencil
	Child roster form	53	Paper-and-Pencil
	Teacher survey	159	Paper-and-Pencil
	Teacher Child report	159	Paper-and-Pencil
	Assistant Teacher survey	159	Paper-and-Pencil
	Child assessments	848 (toddlers & preschoolers only)	Paper-and-Pencil
	Parent interview (including Parent Child Report)	1,018	Interview using TeleForm software
	Classroom observations	159	Assessor Ratings
	Assessor Child Report	848 (toddlers & preschoolers only)	Assessor Ratings

Exhibit A.2 provides a schedule of these recruitment and data collection activities. As soon as OMB clearance is received and the sampling frame is developed (estimated to be January 2017), we will begin recruiting MSHS programs and centers. The first step will be to contact programs to obtain permission to contact their centers that have been randomly selected to be part of the sample. Selected centers will then be recruited within these programs. Once centers agree to participate, we will begin recruiting families within those centers. The Program and Center Component of data collection activities, including mail surveys to program and center directors, will begin in February 2017. Classroom, Family and Child on-site data collection will begin around May 2017. Data collection will occur on a rolling basis for both study components to coincide with the peak operational periods of the centers and will continue as needed through approximately April 2018. Data analysis and reporting activities will begin once data collection is complete and will last until fall 2019.

Exhibit A.2. MSHS Study Timeline

	2016					2017					2018					2019																					
	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S				
	OMB Submission																																				
OMB submission and clearance process																																					
	Recruitment																																				
Sampling frame developed																																					
Recruitment of centers (via programs)																																					
Recruitment of families																																					
	Data Collection																																				
Mail surveys to Program and Center Directors																																					
On-site data collection with teachers, families, children																																					
	Data Analysis and reporting																																				
Data cleaning and analysis																																					
Reporting and data archiving																																					

A.2. Purpose and Use of the Information Collection

The MSHS Study seeks clearance to recruit and collect data for the Program and Center Component (mail surveys to program and center directors) and the Classroom, Family and Child Component (on-site data collection at MSHS centers with MSHS staff, children, and families). Exhibit A.3. presents the recruitment plan for these two components, including the recruitment material(s) that will be used and the distributor of those materials.

Exhibit A.3. Recruitment Plan

Study Component	Target Audience	Recruitment Material	Distributor	Appendix
Program and Center Component (Mail Surveys)	Program and Center Directors	Letter from ACF project officer and study team	Study Team	2
		Follow-up reminders for non-responders	Study Team	5
Classroom, Family and Child Component (On-Site Data Collection)	Program Directors	Email from ACF Project Officer	Study Team	6
		Email from Study Team, with attachments:	Study Team	7
		FAQs for Program and Center Directors	Study Team	8
		Flyer for Program and Center Directors	Study Team	9
		Form to Verify Selected Centers' Information	Study Team	10
		Phone call (will be requested in email)	Study Team	11
	Center Directors	Email from Study Team, with attachments:	Study Team	12
		FAQs for Program and Center Directors	Study Team	8
		Flyer for Program and Center Directors	Study Team	9
		Phone call (will be requested in email)	Study Team	13
	Onsite Coordinators	Letter from Study Team	Study Team	14
		Phone call	Study Team	15
	Teachers and Assistant Teachers	Letter from Study Team	On Site Coordinator	20
		Letter from ACF	On Site Coordinator	21
		Flyer for Parents and Teachers	On Site Coordinator	22
		FAQs for Teachers and Assistant Teachers	On Site Coordinator	23
		Reminder Flyer for Parents and Teachers	On Site Coordinator	28
	Parents	Letter from Study Team	On Site Coordinator	25
		Flyer for Parents and Teachers	On Site Coordinator	22
		FAQs for Parents	On Site Coordinator	26
Reminder Flyer for Parents and Teachers		On Site Coordinator	28	

Exhibit A.4 presents the data collection plan for the study, including the name of each instrument, the respondent, the purpose of the instrument, and the use of the data that will be collected using the instrument.

Exhibit A.4. Data Collection Plan

Study Component	Data Collection Instrument	Respondent	Purpose	Use
Program and Center Component	Program Director survey	Program Director	To gather information on Program Directors' background, experience in MSHS, and program-level characteristics.	To answer research questions about MSHS characteristics, services, and instructional practices. (Research Questions [RQs] 1, 4, 8)
	Center Director survey	Center Director	To gather information on Center Directors' background, experience in MSHS, and center-level characteristics.	To answer research questions about MSHS characteristics, services, and instructional practices. (RQs 1, 4, 8)
Classroom, Family and Child Component	Form to Verify Selected Center Information	Program Director	Verify key information for selected centers.	To finalize center sample and contact centers for recruitment.
	Classroom sampling form	On Site Coordinator	To gather information on MSHS classrooms within selected centers.	To randomly select classrooms for MSHS study.
	Child roster form	On Site Coordinator	To gather information on MSHS children within selected classrooms.	To randomly select children for MSHS study.
	Teacher survey	Teacher	To gather information on teachers' background, experience in MSHS, and classroom activities.	To answer research questions about MSHS characteristics, services, and instructional practices. (RQs 1, 4, 6, 8)
	Teacher Child Report	Teacher	To gather information on teachers' perceptions of child behaviors and skills.	To answer research questions about children's abilities. (RQs 3, 9)
	Assistant Teacher survey	Assistant Teacher	To gather information on assistant teachers' background and experience.	To answer research questions about MSHS characteristics, services, and instructional practices. (RQs 1, 8)
	Child assessments	Child	To gather information about children's skills (with a special focus on language, emergent literacy, and social emotional skills).	To answer research questions about children's abilities. (RQs 3, 9)
	Parent Interview	Parent	To gather information on family characteristics, including parent history, activities within the home, and engagement in MSHS activities.	To answer research questions about MSHS family characteristics. (RQs 2, 5, 7, 8, 9)
	Parent Child Report	Parent	To gather information on parents' perceptions of child behaviors and skills.	To answer research questions about children's abilities. (RQs 3, 9)
	Classroom Observations	Assessor	To gather information on classroom quality.	To answer research questions about classroom quality. (RQs 6)
	Assessor Child Report	Assessor	To gather information on child cognitive, social, and emotional wellbeing.	To answer research questions about children's abilities. (RQs 3, 9)

A.2.1. Program and Center Component

Major study activities to address the MSHS Study research questions for the Program and Center Component include: 1) identifying all program directors and a nationally representative sample of MSHS center directors (see Section B.1 for more information about sampling procedures); 2) inviting program and selected center directors to participate in the mail survey; 3) collecting data via the mail survey; and 4) conducting follow-up for non-response.

Recruitment (Invitation to Participate)

For the Program and Center Component, the MSHS study team plans to survey all program directors and selected center directors between February 2017 and April 2018. When sending out the surveys, the study team will include invitations to participate from ACF leadership and the Abt Study Director (Appendix 2). The study team will send email reminders and also conduct phone follow-up as necessary to reach targeted response rates.

Data Collection

Beginning in February 2017, the study will mail all program directors and selected center directors self-administered paper-and-pencil surveys (Appendix 3 for program directors and Appendix 4 for center directors). Data collection will occur on a rolling basis, to coincide with the operational periods of the centers that follow the agricultural seasons. The purpose of this data collection activity is to gather information on program and center directors' background and experience in MSHS, as well as program- and center-level characteristics. Information obtained from the mail surveys will be used to answer research questions about MSHS program and center characteristics. Findings from the MSHS Study will also help guide OHS, national and regional training and technical assistance providers, and local MSHS programs in supporting policy development and program improvement. Follow-up reminders and phone calls will be used with program and center directors to help improve response rates (Appendix 5).

A.2.2. Classroom, Family and Child Component

Major study activities for the Classroom, Family and Child Component include: 1) selecting a nationally representative sample of MSHS centers and recruiting them to participate in the study; 2) sampling classrooms and children within those centers; 3) recruiting families, teachers, and assistant teachers within participating centers; and 4) collecting data from child assessments, parent interviews (including child reports), teacher surveys and child reports, assistant teacher surveys, and classroom observations. (Additional information about selecting the MSHS sample can be found in Section B.1.)

Recruitment for the Classroom, Family and Child Component

For the Classroom, Family, and Child Component, recruitment will begin February 2017 and data collection will begin in May 2017. Prior to on-site data collection, ACF leadership will send an announcement email to program directors (Appendix 6). Then the study team will contact selected program directors by email (Appendix 7) to let them know which centers within their program have been selected for on-site data collection. Attached to this email will be a document that answers Frequently Asked Questions (Appendix 8), a study flyer that outlines the MSHS data collection activities for both study components (Appendix 9), and a form to verify key information for selected centers (Appendix 10). This email will indicate that the study team will follow-up with program

directors to schedule a subsequent phone call. This phone call, which will be conducted using a prepared script (Appendix 11), will provide directors with additional information about the study and allow them the opportunity to ask questions about study participation. During this call the study team will also encourage program directors to contact the directors of the selected centers to alert them to their selection in the study and encourage them to participate.

After contacting program directors, but prior to on-site data collection, we will also contact selected center directors by email (Appendix 12) to let them know that their center has been selected for on-site data collection. Attached to this email will be a document that answers Frequently Asked Questions (Appendix 8), as well as a study flyer that outlines the MSHS data collection activities for both study components (Appendix 9). This email will indicate that the study team will follow-up with center directors to schedule a subsequent phone call. This phone call, which will be conducted using a prepared script (Appendix 13), will provide center directors with additional information about the study and allow them the opportunity to ask questions about study participation.

At this time, we will also work with center directors to identify an on-site coordinator (OSC) for each center – a designated center staff member who will work with the study team to recruit teachers, assistant teachers, and families; help schedule site visits; and help with obtaining informed consent. We will contact OSCs with a letter from the Abt Study Director (Appendix 14), and will request that OSCs schedule a follow-up call. This phone call will be conducted with OSCs using a prepared script (Appendix 15) to ask for their participation, review OSC responsibilities, and answer any questions.

Next, a member of the study team, in conjunction with the OSC, will schedule the on-site data collection week during a peak attendance period (i.e., a week when the highest number of children are expected to be in attendance). Approximately three weeks prior to the scheduled on-site data collection, we will request that the OSC complete an MSHS Classroom Sampling Form (Appendix 16) and return it to the study team, who will select a random sample of classrooms to participate in the study. We will then request that the OSC complete the MSHS Child Roster Forms (Appendix 17) to obtain key information for each of the MSHS-funded children enrolled in each of the sampled classrooms. Centers may provide this information in various alternative formats including reports from their record systems, hard copy lists, or photocopies of records. Upon receipt of the completed MSHS Child Roster Forms, the study team will select a random sample of children and their families to participate in the study.

The OSC will begin recruiting the teachers and assistant teachers in the selected classrooms. Teacher and assistant teacher packets, including the paper-and-pencil survey (Appendix 18 for teachers and Appendix 19 for assistant teachers) and recruitment materials, will be mailed two weeks prior to the scheduled on-site data collection. Each packet will contain the following recruitment materials: a cover letter from the Abt Study Director (Appendix 20), a letter from ACF leadership and the ACF Project Officer (Appendix 21), a colorful MSHS Study flyer (Appendix 22), and a set of Frequently Asked Questions tailored to teachers and assistant teachers (Appendix 23). Included in the survey packet for teachers (but not assistant teachers) will be a Teacher Child Report form for each sampled child in the teacher's classroom (Appendix 24). The OSC will distribute the packets upon receipt and as soon as possible prior to the on-site visit. Teachers and assistant teachers will be asked to return their completed surveys to the field data collection team by the end of the on-site visit.

The study team will also provide OSCs with materials to recruit parents, including: a cover letter from the Abt Study Director (Appendix 25), a colorful MSHS Study flyer (Appendix 22) and Frequently Asked Questions for Parents (Appendix 26). The OSC will also be responsible for conducting the consenting process with MSHS families. Each parent recruited to participate in the MSHS Study will receive a consent form written in simple and plain language at an appropriate readability level (Appendix 27), which will be available in both Spanish and English. The study team will also ask OSCs to post flyers in advance of data collection, to remind parents and teachers about the upcoming activities (Appendix 28).

Data Collection for the Classroom, Family, and Child Component

A team of field data collectors will visit each center for approximately one week. During this time, they will engage in several data collection activities:

- Assessors will individually assess older toddlers (24-25 months) and preschoolers (36 months and older) and complete child ratings for preschoolers and toddlers (Appendix 34).
- The field data collectors will conduct the face-to-face interviews with parents who have agreed to participate (Appendix 29). As part of the one hour interviews, the interviewers will also ask parents to complete Parent Child Reports on their child (Appendix 30).
- Classroom observers will conduct direct observations of teacher-child interactions that support children’s learning and development in all sampled classrooms (Appendix 31).
- Teachers and assistant teachers will be asked to complete a paper-and-pencil survey (Appendix 18 for the teacher survey, Appendix 19 for the assistant teacher survey). Teachers will also be asked to complete Teacher Child Reports for each sampled child in their classroom (Appendix 24).

ACF will use the data collected to provide a current description of MSHS children, families and staff, as well as the services, practices, and quality of care offered in MSHS centers. Findings from the MSHS Study will help guide OHS, national and regional training and technical assistance providers, and local MSHS programs in supporting policy development and program improvement. (Additional information about data collection procedures can be found in Section B.2.)

A.3. Use of Improved Information Technology to Reduce Burden

The data collection plan reflects sensitivity to issues of efficiency, accuracy, and respondent burden. We will use a combination of mechanical and electronic technology to collect data. For each data collection task, we have selected the form of technology that enables the collection of valid and reliable information in an efficient way while minimizing the burden on MSHS staff and families.

To minimize burden during recruitment and data collection, a study team member will be assigned as the primary contact for each MSHS program and center and the email address and telephone number of this team member will be included on all correspondence. This will ensure that communication with the study team is direct and easy for MSHS staff and for the OSCs.

To minimize burden on program directors, we will pre-populate selected center-level information with the most current Head Start Enterprise System (HSES) and Program Information Report (PIR) data and ask program directors to confirm that information. At the center level, if center directors have existing systems or files that include the information that is being requested on the Classroom Sampling Form or the Child Roster Form, we will work to transfer this information into the desired format, rather than asking center directors to do so. Because roster files contain Personally Identifiable Information, we will require that files be securely transferred by authorized center staff via FedEx or Certified USPS with signature required, or uploaded to Abt's secure data transfer portal that is automatically encrypted. The portal will allow files to be uploaded with minimal effort and time.

Finally, the study team will provide a dedicated email address and toll-free number on recruitment and data collection materials so that MSHS staff and families can call for assistance with any aspect of the study.

A.4. Efforts to Identify Duplication and Use of Similar Information

There are no other studies that offer current and comprehensive information on program quality, child abilities, services, and characteristics of MSHS programs, centers, staff, children, and families. In particular, no other national study has ever collected child-level assessments to describe the characteristics of MSHS children.

To date, three ACF-sponsored efforts provide some insights into MSHS programs and participants. In 199⁵, data collection began for *A Descriptive Study of Children and Families Served by Head Start Migrant Programs* (0980-0260) which included interviews with a nationally representative sample of parents, program directors from all grantee agencies and a sample of delegate agencies, a nationally representative sample of center directors, and a sample of local social service providers. While this study yielded useful information on the characteristics and needs of the migrant farmworker families and the Migrant Head Start (MHS) programs, it did not provide information on seasonal farmworker families. In 2004, ACF authorized the small *MSHS Research Design Development Project* (0970-0262).⁶ Utilizing a small geographically diverse sample, this project focused on piloting MSHS measures with children and families, developing approaches to learn about program operation, and began considering the feasibility of tracking MSHS families.

While these studies produced some useful information about MSHS programs and the families they serve, the efforts were limited and are also up to two decades old. Other national studies of Head Start, including FACES (0970-0151) and Baby FACES (0970-0354), offer regular snapshots of how Head Start programs and families are functioning. However, historically, the Migrant and Seasonal Branch of Head Start has not participated in the national studies describing and evaluating Head Start. Because of the inherent differences between the experiences of migrant and seasonal families and the

⁵ Administration for Children and Families (ACF) (1999a). *A Descriptive Study of Children and Families Served by Head Start Migrant Programs*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

⁶ Administration for Children and Families (2011). *Design for Migrant and Seasonal Head Start Survey: Final Design Report*. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

more traditional Head Start families, as well as the subsequent impact of these differences on the operation of local programs and centers, previous Head Start research cannot be generalized to the MSHS context. The MSHS Study, therefore, will provide the unique information about MSHS programs and families that is not currently available.

To the extent possible, we will use existing data rather than duplicate data collection efforts. As stated above, we will pre-populate selected center-level information with the most current HSES and PIR data and ask program directors to confirm that information.

A.5. Impact on Small Businesses or Other Small Entities

No small businesses are impacted by the data collection in this project.

A.6. Consequences of Not Collecting Information or Collecting Information Less Frequently

The data collection plan described in this supporting statement is necessary to provide a nationally representative depiction of MSHS programs, centers and the families and children they serve.

The consequences of not collecting specific data are described below.

- Should the study fail to collect **the classroom sampling form** or **child roster form**, the study team will not be able to select the sample.
- Without collecting the **child assessment data, including Teacher Child Reports and Parent Child Reports**, ACF will not understand how MSHS children are performing on foundational skills for school success.
- If the study does not collect **program and center director surveys**, ACF cannot describe the characteristics of MSHS programs and centers.
- If the study does not collect **teacher and assistant teacher surveys**, ACF cannot describe the services offered to families and children.
- If the study does not collect **parent interviews**, ACF cannot describe the characteristics of families participating in MSHS, service needs and preferences of MSHS families, or potential barriers to accessing services.

In terms of collecting data less frequently to reduce burden, the data collection for this study occurs only once, so less frequent data collection is not possible.

A.7. Special Circumstances Relating to the Guidelines of 5 CFR 1320.5

There are no special circumstances requiring deviation from these guidelines.

A.8. Comments in Response to the Federal Register Notice and Efforts to Consult Outside the Agency

A.8.1. Federal Register Notice and Comments

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13 and Office of Management and Budget (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 June 3, 2016, Volume 81, Number 107, page 35,774, and provided a sixty-day period for public comment. A copy of this notice is attached as Attachment 33. During the notice and comment period, no substantive comments were received. After the 60 day notice was published, the MSHS Study team conducted its pilot test. Based on feedback from the pilot test, the estimated time to complete surveys was updated and is now included in the 30 day notice and the information collection request.

A.8.2. Consultation with Experts Outside of the Study

The current MSHS Study has integrated information from key MSHS stakeholders and expert consultants. To date, we have held one expert panel to discuss the measurement plan for the study and instrument development. We have also consulted experts on an ongoing basis on issues related to infant and toddler development, as well as unique data collection features of the migrant and seasonal farmworker community. Consultants who have provided input on the MSHS Study to date are listed below in Exhibit A.5.

Exhibit A.5. MSHS Expert Consultants

Member Name	Affiliation
Sally Atkins-Burnett	Mathematica Policy Research
Kim Boller	Mathematica Policy Research
Rachel Chazan-Cohen	University of Massachusetts, Boston
Frank Fuentes	Former Deputy Director of the Office of Head Start, former Acting Associate Commissioner of the Head Start Bureau, and former Chief of the Migrant Head Start Branch
Mariela Páez	Boston College
Catherine Tamis-Lemonda	New York University

A.9. Explanation of Any Incentive for Respondents

For this study, we propose the use of checks and cash (except for children) as follows:

- Teacher –\$5 for each Teacher Child Report for sampled children in their classroom;
- Parent – \$30 cash per family for the interview and Parent Child Reports;
- Child – small gift costing approximately \$2 per child;
- Classroom – \$25 check for the classroom observation;
- Center honorarium – \$250 per center for participation in the onsite data collection activities.

The combination of center honorarium and classroom-level incentive will not exceed \$500 at any one center.

The proposed set of parent, teacher and center incentives are consistent with the amounts recommended in the prior Design Study, particularly when taking into account the difference due to inflation between 2008 and 2016. In addition, the proposed set of incentives also is well-aligned with the type and level of incentives included in several recently approved studies of similar Head Start populations (see Head Start FACES and AIAN Head Start FACES studies - OMB#:0970-0151). Key considerations included the type of incentives (monetary or gifts); which respondent groups (children, families, programs) should receive incentives; and how to balance the cost with the expected benefit. For example, The Survey of Early Head Start Programs offered \$20 gift cards for parents, while FACES compensated parents \$25 for each interview, provided toys for each observed classroom, paid teachers \$5 per child for completing ratings scales, and gave each assessed child a sticker. Programs and families reported being satisfied with both of these sets of incentives (ACF Director Survey, 1998; 2001; 2004). The Head Start Impact Study used a set of incentives similar to FACES. The MSHS Design Development Study (ACF, 2004) paid families \$50 for a parent interview, TCR, and a child assessment, as well as a classroom gift.

Below, we provide a specific justification for each of these incentives:

- Teacher Child Report: A substantial portion of MSHS programs are open for less than 3 months; families come and go in waves over the operational periods. These shorter periods of time for teachers to work with children contribute to a very busy workload. Teacher's participation in completing multiple TCR forms will place a certain level of burden on the teachers and assistant teachers in each sampled classroom. For quality data, it is essential that teachers complete these ratings before a) the programs close and/or b) the selected children and their families depart. In order to offset the teacher burden and encourage timely responses, we included an incentive of \$5 for each TCR completed. This amount is consistent with the amount used in the similar Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey (HS FACES; OMB #: 0970-0151). In fact, the most recent HS FACES increased the Teacher TCR incentive from \$5 to \$10 per completed form. The anticipated response rate, which may seem high, is what we are expecting with the use of the \$5 per completed TCR.
- Parent Interview: In a 2008 report, the team for the MSHS Study Design project partnered with migrant farmworker researchers, program administrators, advocates and families to refine the proposed design for the MSHS Study. The conclusion of that work emphasized the need for respectful incentives for the MSHS families and programs providing data. "Providing incentives to programs and families is respectful of the time they contribute and improves relations with programs and families. The MSHS Design Team therefore suggests that incentives be part of the recruitment of families to the study. The majority of MSHS parents would have to be interviewed in the evenings or weekends due to working long hours in the fields." More specifically, for the families, the Design for the MSHS Study report noted that: "Family incentives are common within previous and ongoing Head Start (HS) and Early Head Start (EHS) longitudinal work, as it is appropriate to provide families with some compensation for the time and effort that make their participation possible. When the research team meets with MSHS families, we anticipate that participants will also receive appropriate compensation. However, with the high mobility and limited connectedness of

migrant families to their short-term communities, it will be difficult to identify appropriate and timely incentives and an efficient means of delivery that will keep families engaged ... in... data collection activities, such as... interviews.” (Design for the MSHS Study report, ACF, 2008).

A somewhat sensitive but key issue related directly to the study’s success will be the level of comfort that the local program staff feels has with the incentives for families. To that end, the incentives must be tailored to be appropriate and adequate for MSHS families. In the Design study, the MSHS Community Consultants reviewed and supported the recommended incentives and they also suggested thinking “outside the box” and going beyond typical incentives. For example, given that the majority of participating parents would have to be interviewed in the evenings or weekends due to working long hours in the fields, the Community Consultants suggested providing dinner for the respondents and their families at the centers to encourage parents to come for evening interview appointments. This strategy has been used successfully by many MSHS centers to increase participation in parent meetings and activities. Providing incentives to MSHS parents and children is consistent with OMB policies on the effective use of incentives to increase survey response rates and ensure high quality data, particularly with respect to a traditionally hard to reach population like MSHS families and their children, where there are significant burdens involved with their participation in data collection activities (see page 69

https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/omb/inforeg/pmc_survey_guidance_2006.pdf). Similarly, the provision of incentives to programs and families also is respectful of the time they contribute, the additional burdens encounter to participate, and improves long-term relations with families and with programs. A large majority of the MSHS parents work long hours in the fields, live considerable distances from the MSHS centers and as such many likely would have to be interviewed in the evenings and weekends and travel considerable distances to participate in the data collection activities. In addition to these logistical burdens, many MSHS parents are somewhat cautious and/or less trusting of outside individuals, particularly those conducting a study on behalf of the government. Recent fears of deportation are also presenting barriers to parents in bringing their children to preschool.⁷ Recent concerns about deportation also may be a barrier for parents to bring their children to preschool while in the fields. Small monetary amounts have been used successfully in prior studies with MSHS families to increase response rates (Barrueco, 2007), as well as in a small pilot test for the current study. The Design for MSHS Study report recommended a parent stipend (\$25). The current MSHS team recommends a parent stipend of \$30, which is generally consistent when taking into account the difference due to inflation between 2008 and 2016 (www.bls.gov).

Below, we provided detailed justification for the parent and child incentives, organized into the following categories:

- o **Logistic Obstacles:** Providing a stipend to MSHS parents and children is consistent with previously published OMB policies on the effective use of incentives to increase

⁷ See, for example, <http://www.scpr.org/news/2016/12/27/67427/when-deportation-fears-trickle-down-to-preschool-a/>

survey response rates and ensure high quality data, particularly with respect to a traditionally hard to reach population like MSHS families and their children. A large majority of the MSHS parents work extended hours in the fields, live considerable distances from the MSHS centers and many likely will be reluctant to spend the money and time to travel to the centers, missing work, to complete the interview in the evenings or on the weekend. The stipend will be a small amount in cash, to address the cost of transportation, child care for other siblings, and lost work hours.

- o **MSHS Family Caution.** In addition to these logistical burdens, many MSHS parents are cautious or less trusting of outside individuals, particularly those conducting a study on behalf of the government. Many of the MSHS families have immigration histories and interactions/knowledge of federal services that make them wary of participation in federal research efforts (Communication, MSHS National Association). The stipend is a small respectful approach to reduce logistical barriers and encourage participation.
- o **MSHS Community Buy In.** The MSHS Community is particularly tightly woven (approx. 62 grantees total), and MSHS programs are very protective of the families they serve. In two national stakeholder meetings (with MSHS staff, directors, and parents) in 2016, there was strong endorsement of stipends, particularly for the families, if the MSHS programs were to be studied. We depend on programs for the recruitment for this study and differential payment or no payment for parents will alienate the program staff and, therefore, the families. MSHS programs are often closely linked to HS and EHS programs, and MSHS staff are therefore well aware of typical stipend procedure in HS/EHS research (e.g., from HS FACES, the National Agricultural Workers Survey, Baby FACES studies), and will not understand why these typical procedures are not being applied to the vulnerable, at risk, overworked and understudied MSHS families. Differential payment or no payment is likely to greatly reduce the possibility of this study effectively establishing good will and a working relationship with the programs and gathering high quality family data that represents the families they serve.
- o **Understudied Families.** Impacts of poverty, work and health risks, and immigration issues have been examined with agricultural workers (see Design for MSHS Study report for overview). However, migrant and seasonal farmworker families are particularly understudied, and have not been included in most previous federal or academic research regarding early care and education, due to measurement limitations, language and culture, and difficulty in accessing the families. HS FACES, for example, has provided information about Head Start services and families since 1998, but MSHS has been excluded from this work. The MSHS study provides a groundbreaking opportunity to establish an understanding of the family needs and perspectives and improve program understanding of how to address those needs. It is expected that the lack of a payment to families will undermine this effort and perhaps gravely reduce the quality of the data that will represent these understudied families.

o **Program/Family Timing.** There is a unique logistic issue with studying MSHS programs that heightens the need for timely responses from families and teachers, which in turn necessitates incentives. The MSHS programs themselves are inherently elusive, with a substantial proportion of centers open for less than three months in the year. Families come and go in waves over the operational periods of centers, depending on local agricultural opportunities. A limited window of opportunity exist in each case to be able to gather high quality and effectively link program, teacher, parent and child data. To that end, the incentives must be tailored to be appropriate and adequate for the MSHS families, programs, and staff. In the Design study, the advocates, program staff, researchers, and parents supported the recommended incentives and they also suggested thinking “outside the box” and going beyond typical incentives. For example, given that the majority of participating parents would have to be interviewed in the evenings or weekends due to working long hours in the fields, the MSHS Design team suggested providing dinner for respondents and their families at the centers to encourage parents to come for evening interview appointments. This strategy has been used successfully by many MSHS centers to increase participation in parent meetings and activities (Design for MSHS Study Report, 2008). This is a nominal and reasonable amount to provide in return for the child’s participation.

- **Child Interview:** The proposed child incentive of small gift costing approximately \$2 per child is consistent with the \$2-\$3 cloth age appropriate books or sturdy cardboard books and stickers that had been proposed in the Design Study. This is a nominal and reasonable amount to provide in return for the child’s participation.
- **Classroom Observation:** We propose a \$25 per classroom incentive paid in the form of a check. The MSHS Study Design report did recommend the use of gift cards to compensate for classroom observations. However, we have proposed providing a check to the center based on the number of classrooms that are observed. The check can be used to purchase classroom materials. Checks are safer than gift cards in the field because they are less likely to be stolen and based on Westat’s purchasing department, gift cards have many disadvantages. For example, there are purchase and shipping fees associated with gift cards that make them more expensive than using checks. Gift cards also have expiration dates (often 90 days from the date of issue), activation and PIN requirements, less flexibility in terms of purchasing than cash, fees associated with lost or stolen cards, and return fees for unused cards. Based on these reasons, we believe that providing a check is a better option.
- **Center Participation:** The Design for MSHS Study report underestimated the effort that will be required from an MSHS program staff to support the study. The current MSHS Study proposes a \$250 honorarium for each of the 53 MSHS centers that will be involved in on-site data collection activities for the MSHS Study. As noted above, many family interviews will occur in the evenings and on weekends, involving extensive hours from program staff providing support to the research effort (including scheduling support and provision of a meal for participating families.) However, an incentive to the program will address many more issues. To address OMB concerns, the MSHS Study team has already cancelled incentives to

teachers for completing their surveys. A contribution to the center will likely still encourage teacher responsiveness to the survey. Further, for recruitment of families, it is important to have complete center buy-in to the study. Families have developed trust with a range of program staff, and if the program staff are not uniformly positive about the study, families will not cooperate nor will teachers be responsive to the surveys. It is likely that most center staff will need to respond to questions and encourage participation and that (despite our best efforts) some program activities will be disrupted by study activities. A gift of \$250 to the center respectfully thanks the program for a complete effort in support of the study.

MSSH programs are often closely linked with Head Start programs, and are aware of typical incentives offered to programs and families. To be inconsistent with other honoraria used by OPRE in federal studies of Head Start is likely to alienate programs and undermine recruitment of families and responsiveness of teachers. This proposed center level honorarium of \$250 for this study is consistent with the previously approved center level incentives for both the Head Start FACES (OMB#:0970-0151) and the American Indian and Alaskan Native (AIAN) Head Start (OMB#:0970-0151) studies. In the HS FACES study, sampled centers received \$250 each spring for data collection activities including child sampling and consent gathering. In AIAN FACES, sampled centers also received \$250 for data collection activities (see Exhibit A.4 on page 19 of OMB Part A).

A.10. Assurance of Privacy Provided to Respondents

To provide assurance that the privacy of individuals and the data they provide will be protected, the study team will include written information and assurance regarding respondents' protections as part of the recruitment and consent letters before asking them to consent to participating in the study. Privacy disclosures will be repeated (in written or oral mode) to respondents during the introduction of both the survey and the interview. All interviewers and data collection staff will be trained to be able to explain privacy information in detail or answer any related questions respondents raise.

We have crafted carefully worded consent forms (Appendix 27) with information provided in simple and easy to understand language at appropriate readability levels that outlines how participants' privacy will be ensured and what is being asked of them. The consent forms will assure respondents that the information collected will be kept private to the extent permitted by law and will be used for research purposes only, that responses will be reported only in the aggregate, and that their contact name, address and other survey data will not be shared with the MSSH program staff. The study team will obtain the signed, informed consent form from all participating parents, providing consent for their completion of the interview and for their children to complete the assessments. The team will not seek child's assent because they are too young. However, if the child refuses the study team will not insist on continuing. The consent letter clearly states that parents and children may choose to withdraw from the study at any point in time, without penalty or loss of service. In addition, we will obtain a National Institutes of Health Certificate of Confidentiality (CoC) to protect parents' identities and privacy and notice of this CoC will be included in the consent letter.

To further ensure privacy, we will remove all personal identifiers that could be used to link individuals with their responses from all completed study instruments. All hard copy materials are transmitted to and from the field using FedEx or Certified USPS with signature required. Field staff are not permitted to leave packages unattended while they are awaiting pick up nor to waive the signature requirement for delivery. We will generate a set of identification labels with unique project and respondent ID numbers and bar codes to ensure secure and efficient transmittal and receipt of the data. These labels will be affixed to each of the data collection instruments for a respondent.

Abt and its subcontractors have extensive corporate and administrative security systems in place to protect private project information and prevent the unauthorized release of personal records, including state-of-the-art hardware and software for encryption that meets federal standards; physical security, including limited key card access and locked data storage areas; and other methods of data protection (for example, requirements for regular password updating). Abt secures individually identifiable and other sensitive project information and strictly controls access to sensitive information on a need-to-know basis.

Survey, interview and data management procedures that ensure the security of data and privacy of information will be a major part of the data collection training. Additionally, the study team will require all data collection staff to sign a Data Collector Code of Conduct and Assurance of Confidentiality Form (Appendix 32) prior to the data collection period, stating that no data will be released to unauthorized personnel.

Information will not be maintained in a paper or electronic system from which they are actually or directly retrieved by an individuals' personal identifier.

A.11. Justification for Sensitive Questions

To achieve its primary goal of describing the characteristics of the children and families served by MSHS, we will ask parents and teachers a few sensitive questions, including some aimed at assessing feelings of depression. This information has been collected and used in previous reports of national studies of Head Start, including FACES, to describe the Head Start population. In this study, similar procedures will be followed in order to describe the wellbeing of parents and teachers within the MSHS population. Parents will also be asked about household income, and MSHS staff will be asked about their salaries. These sensitive questions obtain important information for understanding behaviors and needs, and previous national studies of Head Start (i.e., FACES) have used them. In addition, the consent form will also inform parents and staff that participation is voluntary, that they do not have to answer questions that make them uncomfortable, and that none of the responses they provide will be reported back to program staff.

A.12. Estimates of Annualized Burden Hours and Costs

The proposed data collection does not impose a financial burden on respondents, and they will not incur any expense other than the time spent participating.

Exhibit A.6 presents the current request to cover data collection activities related to MSHS children and their parents as well as MSHS staff (program directors, center directors, OSCs, teachers, and

assistant teachers). The total annual burden is expected to be 2,631 hours for all of the instruments in the current data collection. Recruitment and data collection is expected to take place over a 15 month period.

To compute the total estimated annual cost, the total burden hours were multiplied by the average hourly wage for each adult participant, based on median weekly wages from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Population Survey estimates (fourth quarter of 2015).⁸ The median salary for full-time employees over age 25 with a bachelor's degree was used for program directors, center directors, teachers, and OSCs (\$28.43 per hour). The median salary for full-time employees over the age of 25 who are high school graduates with no college experience (\$16.95 per hour) was used for parents and assistant teachers.

⁸ For more information, please see <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/wkyeng.pdf>. Weekly earnings (page 13) were converted into hourly wages by dividing the total amount by 40 hours.

Exhibit A.6. MSHS Estimates of Annualized Burden Hours and Costs

	Instrument	Respondent	Total Number of Respondents	Number of Responses per Respondent	Average Burden Hours per Response	Estimated Annual Burden Hours	Average Hourly Wage	Total Annual Cost
Program and Center Component	Program Director survey	Program Director	53	1	0.67	36	\$28.43	\$1,009.55
	Center Director survey	Center Director	253	1	0.67	170	\$28.43	\$4,819.17
Classroom, Family and Child Component	Call script for Program Directors	Program Director	24	1	1	24	\$28.43	\$682.32
	Form for Program Directors to verify key information for selected centers	Program Director	24	1	0.5	12	\$28.43	\$341.16
	Call script for Center Directors	Center Director	53	1	1	53	\$28.43	\$1,506.79
	Call script for On Site Coordinators	On Site Coordinator	53	1	1	53	\$28.43	\$1,506.79
	Classroom sampling form	On Site Coordinator	53	1	0.5	27	\$28.43	\$753.40
	Child roster form	On Site Coordinator	53	3	0.25	40	\$28.43	\$1,130.09
	Teacher survey	Teacher	159	1	0.67	107	\$28.43	\$3,028.65
	Teacher child report	Teacher	159	8	0.17	216	\$28.43	\$6,147.70
	Assistant Teacher survey	Assistant Teacher	159	1	0.33	52	\$16.95	\$889.37
	Parent consent form	Parent	1,018	1	0.25	255	\$16.95	\$4,313.78
	Child assessments (preschoolers and older toddlers only)	Child	848	1	0.67	568	n.a.	n.a
	Parent interview (including Parent child report)	Parent	1,018	1	1	1018	\$16.95	\$17,255.10
Estimated Total						2,631		\$43,383.87

A.13. Estimates of Other Total Cost Burden to Respondents and Record Keepers

OSCs will be paid \$200 for their critically-needed assistance in recruiting families, securing parents' informed consent, and scheduling the multiple data collection activities that need to be completed in only one week on site at each center. The OSCs' familiarity with families and the families' trust in the local OSC will be imperative for a successful data collection effort. The amount proposed is the equivalent of 20 hours of their time, which will certainly be needed to obtain parent consent from at least 24 parents for interviews (and possibly more if parental consent is needed for non-assessed children in classrooms being observed); to schedule 24 child assessment sessions and a minimum of three classroom observations; and to conduct follow-up with teachers for submission of surveys and Teacher Child Reports.

A.14. Cost to the Federal Government

The total cost for data collection related to the instruments within this current request is \$1,943,362. These costs include the sampling, data collection, data processing, and analysis.

A.15. Explanation for Program Changes or Adjustments

Not applicable.

A.16. Plans for Tabulation and Publication and Project Time Schedule

A.16.1. Analysis Plan

The analyses will (1) describe characteristics of MSHS programs, centers, families and children, (2) describe program, classroom, and family practices, (3) examine relationships among program, family, and child characteristics, (4) relate program, family, and child characteristics to program, center, and classroom practices, and (5) relate program, family, and classroom characteristics or practices to children's skills and abilities. Analyses will employ a variety of methods, including descriptive statistics (means, percentages) for the full sample and select subgroups (i.e., geographic region and upstream/downstream programs, migrant farmworker families, seasonal farmworker families, infants/toddlers, and preschoolers), simple tests of differences across groups (e.g., t-tests, chi-Square tests), bivariate correlations, and multivariate regression analyses. For all analyses, appropriate design-based parameter estimates, standard errors, confidence intervals, and design effects will be produced. Analysis weights that take into account the complex multi-stage cluster design and non-response at each stage will be used. The use of weights and an appropriate variance estimation method, such as linearization or a replication method, will account for the multi-level data structure (children in classrooms, in centers in programs) and stratification in the design, and will produce accurate standard errors. Standard errors that reflect the design are necessary to indicate the precision of the national estimates and for statistical tests.

Descriptive Statistics and Relational Analyses

For descriptive analyses, frequencies and percentages or means and standard deviations will be estimated, as will their standard errors. For continuous variables (e.g., maximum number of children

enrolled in the program at any given time; average family income, scores on assessments of children's language skills, scores on classroom observation measures), means and standard deviations will be estimated for the full sample and for key subgroups (e.g., programs by geographic region; migrant farmworkers; preschool children. For categorical variables (e.g., location, race/ethnicity, service needs), frequencies and percentages will be estimated.

In addition to descriptions of single characteristics, relational analyses will also be conducted to examine the association between two or more characteristics. These relational analyses may involve correlations (between two continuous variables) or, more commonly, cross-tabulations between two or more characteristics. Where appropriate, tests of associations (e.g., chi-square, t-test, F-test) will be estimated to examine differences among the variables of interest.⁹

Multivariate Regression Analysis

Multivariate regression analyses will be conducted to examine the relationships between: MSHS family characteristics and children's language skills and social emotional abilities; classroom quality and teacher-child language use; contextual characteristics (programs, staff, families, and communities) and bilingual language use in the classrooms and with families; children's language exposure at home and their language skills; and family characteristics and children's language skills and social emotional competencies.

Although the associations examined will be based on information collected at a single point in time, they may still be informative about relationships of interest. For example, one might expect to find a relationship between families' access to health insurance and health outcomes, or between families' housing instability and children's abilities. Establishment of these relationships will not provide evidence of causality; it may be possible that there are unmeasured causes of both contextual factors and outcome measures, for example. However, evidence of these hypothesized relationships will inform future research and, potentially, program development.

Regression analyses will examine the relationship between two key variables of interest, a predictor (e.g., family language use) and an outcome (e.g., child language skills), and will control for other characteristics (e.g., child, family, home environment, mobility, program, and center characteristics) that may be related to the outcome, in order to isolate the relationship of interest. The set of variables that will be used as covariates will be adjusted somewhat for regression analyses at different levels. For example, models examining the relationship between classroom quality and teacher-child language use will control for classroom-level child characteristics (e.g., percent of children in classroom who are indigenous language speakers; percent of children in the classroom with a parent who is a migrant farmworker) rather than individual-level child and family characteristics.

The parameter estimate for the predictor (e.g., program or other contextual factors) will quantify the difference in the outcome (e.g., child or family functioning) associated with differences in the predictor. Model estimation will produce accurate standard errors, reflecting the design, to estimate the precision of estimated parameters and enable correct statistical tests. A t-test will be used to determine if the relationship is statistically significant. In other words, a p-value < .05 will provide

⁹ No tests of differences will be conducted between migrant and seasonal farmworker families or between toddler and preschool-age children.

affirmative evidence that a relationship (e.g., between a particular contextual factor and child functioning) exists in the MSHS population.

A.16.2. Time Schedule and Publications

After data collection ends in spring 2018, we will clean and analyze data (approximately May to December 2018). The following products will be produced for this study: (1) a set of descriptive tables on key indicators (June 2018); (2) a final report (October 2018-September 2019); and (3) two issue briefs (date and topics TBD). The study team will prepare a full final report including project design, implementation, and results. These deliverables will describe the population of children enrolled in MSHS, as well as their parents, teachers, classrooms, and programs. The tables and the final report will include: (1) descriptive statistics on the characteristics of MSHS programs, centers, families and children; (2) descriptive statistics on MSHS services, instructional practices and quality; and (3) associations between MSHS characteristics and child/family well-being. Issue briefs will examine specific topics in greater depth or for particular subgroups.

A.17. Reason(s) Display of OMB Expiration Date Is Inappropriate

The OMB number and expiration date will be displayed on the cover page for each instrument used in the study. For parent interviews, the field data collection team will display this information on the consent form, and will verbally communicate this information to interviewees.

A.18. Exceptions to Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

No exceptions are necessary for this data collection.