Introduction and Methods 1

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's, Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) is conducting the Access, Participation, Eligibility and Certification Study Series (APEC III). The purpose is to estimate, and identify ways to reduce errors in payments under the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and the School Breakfast Program (SBP). Components of the data collection include data abstractions, meal observations, and talking directly to parents and guardians, School Food Authority (SFA) Directors and Cafeteria Managers to better understand if there are parts of the application, certification, meal reimbursement or claiming process that could be improved.

In preparation for study launch, Westat's Instrument Design, Evaluation and Analysis (IDEA) Services tested five data collection instruments – the Household Survey, the SFA Director Survey, and the in-depth interview guides for households, SFA Directors and Cafeteria Managers. The goals of the testing were to ensure that: 1) respondents are interpreting the questions as intended and can easily respond and 2) that interviewers can easily administer the instruments. All testing materials were reviewed and approved by the Westat IRB prior to recruitment and data collection. As shown in Table 1-1, IDEA Services completed 2 to 9 telephone or in-person interviews for each data collection instrument, using cognitive, feasibility and expert review interviews. The in-person interviews were conducted at Westat's Rockville facilities. All interviews lasted an hour and were audio-recorded for later review and analysis. Three of the in-person interviews were observed by APEC III project staff either in the interview room itself (when the interview was conducted in a conference room), or from a separate observation room.

Table 1-1.   Completed Interviews by APEC III Instrument

APEC III Instrument	Interview Mode	Interview Type	Completed Interviews
Household Survey	In-person	Cognitive	9
Household In-depth Interview Guide	Telephone	Feasibility	3
SFA Director Survey	Telephone	Expert Review	9
SFA Director In-depth Interview Guide	Telephone	Feasibility	3
Cafeteria Manager In-depth Interview Guide	Telephone	Feasibility	2*

* The original target was to complete 3 interviews with Cafeteria Managers.

The remainder of this report describes the recruitment strategies and respondent characteristics; data collection methods; approach to data analysis; and issues that surfaced during testing. We also include for FNS review and approval our recommendations for addressing the issues found in testing. Once the recommendations are approved, we will submit all instruments with the approved revisions incorporated in tracked changes.

1.1   Recruitment Methods

1.1.1   SFA Directors

IDEA recruited SFA Directors from a list of 61 contacts who participated in focus groups for Child Nutrition Analysis and Modeling (CNAM) Task 10—Healthy Hunger Free Kids Act Research Briefs in 2015 and had given consent to participate in future studies. To be eligible, respondents in the current testing effort must have been knowledgeable about all SFA activities including the application certification process, direct certification process, meal claiming, meal counting and claiming reports, and for those districts with Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) schools, the process to determine an Identified Student Percentage (ISP) rate.

Table 1-2 provides demographic information for the nine SFA Directors who participated in the expert review telephone interviews and three who participated in the feasibility telephone interviews for the in-depth interview guide. Only one of the nine SFA Directors participated in both the expert review and feasibility interviews. Two others participated in only the feasibility interview. While most were female, respondents had a range of experience in their jobs, size of district and number of CEP schools in their districts. Almost half reported that they conduct an administrative or secondary review of school meal applications. SFA Director respondents participated as an individual (on their own personal time), were given $75 per interview and used their own discretion when scheduling the session time.

Table 1-2.   SFA Director Respondents

Respondent ID	Gender	Years' experience	Number of Schools in District	Number of CEP Schools	Conducts administrative or secondary review
1	M	1.25	230	2	No
2	F	16	4		DK
3	M	2.5	1	N	Yes
4	F	25	25	N	No
5	F	30	60		Yes
6	F	18	3	N	No
7**	F	2.5	10		Yes
8	F	8	4	N	DK
9	F	8	12	N	Yes
10*	F	5	18		No
11*	F	8	7	N	Yes

* Respondent participated in the in-depth interview only.

**Respondent participated in both the survey and in-depth interviews.

1.1.2   Household Respondents

Respondents for the Household Survey in-person cognitive interviews and feasibility telephone interviews for the in-depth interview guide were recruited from a Craigslist advertisement for parents of school-age children who had applied for free and reduced-price school meals in the 2015-2016 school year. All respondents had a child in elementary, middle, or high school and had filled out an application for free and reduced price school meals during the 2015-2016 school year. During screening, respondents were also asked if they currently have a child who receives free or reduced price school meals, and if they receive Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits.

Table 1-3 shows demographics for the nine parents who participated in the cognitive and feasibility interviews, including information on receiving free or reduced price lunch and TANF or SNAP. Respondents were given $50 for completing the Household Survey cognitive interview, and an additional $20 for compiling and bringing income documentation with them to the cognitive interview. From these 9 respondents, three agreed to participate in the in-depth feasibility interview, for which they were given an additional $30.

Table 1-3.   Household Survey Respondents

Receive Free or Reduced Price lunch	Receive TANF or SNAP	Age	Gender	Hispanic	Race	Education	Household in-depth interview respondent
Yes	No	29	Female	No	Black	Some college	X
Yes	No	45	Female	No	Black	College	
Yes	No	38	Male	No	Black	Some college	X
Yes	No	34	Female	No	Black	College	
Yes	Yes	28	Female	No	Black	Some college	
Yes	Yes	41	Male	No	Black	High School	
Yes	Yes	31	Female	Yes	Black	College	
No	No	34	Female	Yes	Hispanic	Some college	
No	No	35	Female	No	White	College	X

1.1.3   Cafeteria Managers

As shown in Table 1-1, we aimed to complete feasibility interviews to test the in-depth interview guide with three Cafeteria Managers. We searched for Cafeteria Managers at the elementary, middle, and high school levels by posting Craigslist ads and by utilizing personal networks. We found two respondents through personal networking. The Craigslist ad yielded no responses. To be eligible for the Cafeteria Manager interviews, respondents needed to be the person in charge of meal counting and claiming records for the breakfast and lunch school meals program, and the person in charge of running the cash register in the school cafeteria. In addition, they needed to be extremely knowledgeable, or very knowledgeable about the meal counting, claiming and recording processes at their school. Ultimately, we conducted two feasibility interviews by phone with the Cafeteria Managers shown in Table 1-4. They participated as an individual (on their own personal time) received $50 for participating and used their own discretion when scheduling the interview time.

Table 1-4.   Cafeteria Manager Respondents

Age	Gender	How knowledgeable about meal counting, claiming & recording processes?	How long working in current position?	How long working in cafeteria operations?	Grade Level of School	Number of Students in School
42	M	Extremely	2 years	6 years	Head Start–6th	630
59	F	Very	5 years	18 years	6th - 8th	600

1.2   Data Collection

Three trained senior interviewers conducted the interviews. The interview sessions lasted up to 60 minutes and included the following:

- The interviewer administered the study introduction—explaining the study purpose and the respondent's rights as a research subject.

- Respondents in in-person Household Survey interviews were asked to read and sign a consent form to document awareness of the voluntary nature of participation, confidentiality, and agreement with the discussion being recorded. For all other interviews, the telephone interview respondents were asked for their verbal consent after interviewers explained the voluntary nature of their participation and confidentiality, and requested that the interview be audio recorded.

- For in-person interviews, which were all conducted at Westat, respondents were informed that observers may be present.

- The interviewer followed the interview guide and administered scripted probes.

- At the conclusion of the interview, the respondents were provided an opportunity to offer any other additional feedback or reactions.

- After the end of the session, the respondent was thanked for participating. Cash incentives were given to in-person interview respondents and checks were mailed to telephone interview respondents.

The three different approaches used to test the five data collection instruments – expert review, feasibility interviews, and cognitive interviews -- are described below.

1.2.1   Expert Review Interview: SFA Director Survey

The approach for testing the SFA Director Survey was an expert review interview administered by telephone, in which respondents are asked to review and provide comments on the survey without actually answering the questions. It would have been difficult, if not impossible, for respondents to track down and provide the significant amount of school meal program data the survey asks for, as well as complete a traditional cognitive interview, within the hour of time we were requesting from them. Providing the requested data on a paper instrument when ultimately the survey will be conducted online would have also added unnecessary burden to the testing task, and perhaps yielded findings and recommendations that weren't directly applicable to the online instrument. SFA

Director respondents were sent the survey prior to the interview and asked to document comments and feedback about items that they thought might be difficult to understand or problematic to answer. During the interview, the interviewer and respondent went through each section of the survey and discussed the respondent's documented feedback in response to interviewer administered scripted probes.

1.2.2   Feasibility Interview: SFA Director, Cafeteria Manager, and Household In-Depth Interview Guides

IDEA used feasibility interviews to test the Household, Cafeteria Manager and SFA Director in-depth interview guides. Because cognitive testing is itself a form of in-depth interview, it is not the preferred approach for testing in-depth interview guides as respondents tend to confuse the tested questions with the "probes" that are asked to help evaluate the tested questions. Instead, the approach for testing these types of qualitative data collection instruments is to administer them as written and observe how respondents respond, noting any difficulties they encounter. The feasibility interviews were conducted over the phone with all three types of respondents. Interviewers administered the full in-depth interview guide, timed the process, and observed and documented issues that arose for both respondents and interviewers. Household respondents were emailed a copy of or link to their school districts' school meal application prior to the interview, then asked to refer to the application during the interview and provide feedback about specific items and sections on the application. After completion of the in-depth guide across all the feasibility interviews, interviewers followed up on any areas of difficulty respondents encountered while answering questions.

1.2.3   Cognitive Interview: Household Survey

The Household Survey lent itself best to the traditional cognitive testing approach, whereby interviewers administered the survey instrument along with retrospective scripted probes, by survey section, to address specific research objectives. IDEA conducted the cognitive interviews in-person at Westat facilities. Prior to the interview, respondents were sent an income documentation worksheet, asked to complete it on their own, and to bring it along with the associated income documentation to the interview. At the end of the interview, when observers were present, the interviewer also administered additional unscripted probes on behalf of the observers when requested.

1.3   Data Analysis

Interviewers also served as analysts. They reviewed the interview audio recordings and their own notes to produce written summaries of each interview. Interview summaries included respondent answers to items, discussion of responses to probes, and (where appropriate) verbatim quotes. Analysts identified themes and patterns within the data, focusing on problems and issues with the instruments overall as well as individual items. Themes and patterns were organized, evaluated, synthesized, and summarized into report form.

1.4   Findings and Recommendations

The remainder of this report summarizes the issues found in each instrument we tested and provides recommendations for addressing the issues.

Summary of Recommendations 2

2.1 Expert Review Interviews: SFA Director Survey

SFA Director Survey Findings	Recommendations
1 Global Issues While most findings on the SFA director survey are related to a specific item, several issues revealed may result in more comprehensive revisions to the survey. They are issues with race and ethnicity items, including "Don't know" as a response option, and in some cases finding a replacement for the term "certification."	
a. <u>Race and Ethnicity Items: A10 and D6b, c & d</u> Data on student characteristics are requested in items in Section A and D. Not all respondents have access to race, ethnicity, and gender data. One respondent said she does not have direct or indirect access to the student information system where race and ethnicity information is stored. Two other respondents said the ethnicity/race data is not readily available but could probably be obtained by getting it from somebody else. One of those two respondents reported she felt uncomfortable providing that information since the department of education instructs them not to be discriminatory. One wasn't sure if gender is tracked.	■ Leave items as they are. Add the response option "Data Not Available."
b. <u>"Don't know" Response Option: A12 and F3</u> Although this issue was only brought up in regard to two items, it may be an issue for many other items in the survey as well. For question A12 ("Does your SFA receive a NSLP 60% subsidy?"), one respondent did not know if her SFA receives a NSLP 60% subsidy. She would answer "no." Two respondents did not know the answer to question F3 ("In what year did your district begin using direct certification?") because they were not in their current position when their district started using direct certification. One said she could get the answer from the state department or her assistant. The other didn't know how she would find the answer.	■ Add a "Don't Know" response option. For certain types of items, it may be more helpful to understand that respondents don't know the answer rather than force them to choose an answer that may not accurately reflect their situation.

SFA Director Survey Findings	Recommendations
c. <u>Use of the term "certification"</u> Some respondents confused "certification", when referring to the approval of applications for free or reduced price meals, with "direct certification."	■ Define "certification" and where needed, define "direct certification" based on the National School Lunch Act, regulations and FNS guidance such as the Eligibility Manual for School Meals.
d. **D6e, f, & g** These items refer to "students certified for free meals, reduced price meals, or paid meals." One respondent pointed out that the use of "certified" is too close to the term "direct certification" which has a very specific meaning. He suggested the term "meals by application" instead. For another respondent the term "certified" means the list of students the state sends who receive food assistance. So that respondent would use the numbers from the state. She also said that for D6f, she does not have any "certified" students, but that she does have students who are "approved through their application." Another explained that the term "certified" is not used to talk about "paid" students, but that it is okay to use it to talk about free and reduced price students.	■ One respondent suggested the following replacement phrase in D6e, f, & g: D6e. Number of enrolled students approved for free meals by application (Non CEP School). D6f. Number of enrolled students approved for reduced price meals by application (Non CEP School). D6g. Number of enrolled students determined as paid meals status by application (Non CEP School).
e. **E8, E9, E10, & E13** These items refer to either a student's certification status or the certification process. One respondent explained that using the word certification "gets you mixed up with the direct certification, and they're two separate things." "They're just wanting the results of a free and reduced application that has been processed. I really wouldn't call that certification." Another respondent said "eligibility" is easier to understand. Another said to use "free and reduced status" instead of "certification."	■ Use additional clarifying language for certification in this section. The question(s) will include an example, or clarification of definition and/or intent of the question. (E7, E8, E9, E10 & E13).

SFA Director Survey Findings	Recommendations
2 Survey Instructions No consistent problems but 3 respondents made suggestions worth noting.	■ For the online SFA Director survey, provide the survey as a PDF for respondents to print out and use to record data as they gather it in preparation for entering it online. ■ Include in the instructions assurance that if the respondent stops part-way through the online survey, they can come back to it later with their entered answers saved. ■ Include in the instructions that the online survey will take an hour or less to complete.
3 Q1 The first three questions on the survey ask how data will be reported and for what dates. The first question, Q1, uses the terms "opportunity to participate," which was confusing for two respondents in California. California's ED Code 49558 requires all schools to offer at least one meal per day. The question implies that schools have a choice, but not in California. The number of enrolled students is the same as the number who have the opportunity to participate in the program.	■ Add the following instruction to Q1: "Select both if all enrolled students have the opportunity to participate."
4 A3 A3 asks "How many public school districts or legal entities are in your SFA?" One respondent thought the term "legal entities" sounded odd and said it's not commonly used in this context. He suggested using "private school districts" instead.	■ Revise A3 to: "What is the total number of school districts (public and private) in your SFA?"
5 A7 A7 asks how SFAs manage their food service operations. The phrase "consulting company or independent consultant" was unfamiliar to one respondent, who suggested defining the terms used or using "vended meal company." The respondent uses a vended meal company but was unsure if he would answer "yes" to this question, even though he said third party companies that bring food ready to go "do try to consult with us and tell us what to do."	■ Include "vended meal company" in A7 so that the item reads: "Is your SFA food service operation under the direction of a food service management company, or does your SFA use a consulting company, vended meal

SFA Director Survey Findings	Recommendations
	company, or independent consultant to help plan or manage food service operations?"
6 A8 A8 gives instructions, in parentheses, on how to define elementary schools. In general, respondents tend to overlook text in parentheses. One respondent appears to have missed the parenthetical instructions for how to define the elementary schools category. She noted that she intentionally excluded Pre-K students because of the word "access" in the second column of A8.	■ Remove the parentheses from the question stem. Also, move the instructions to the beginning of the paragraph, where respondents are less likely to miss them because they are "forced" to read them before the question is posed. See revised instructions below. A8. Elementary schools are most typically thought of as grades K-5, middle schools or junior high as 6-8, and high schools as grades 9-12. In the table below, please record the number of schools and enrolled students for you entire SFA, overall and by type of school. Record the information as of <DATE>. If your schools don't align with the categories listed in the table, please fit them as closely as possible.
7 A8 & A9 A8 and A9 ask for data by grade level and by type of meal plan, respectively. The difference between A8 and A9 was not clear to one respondent, who said they seemed repetitive. She suggested combining them.	■ Label the data tables in A8 and A9 to help respondents understand the difference. For example: A8: Schools and Enrolled Students by Grade Level A9: Schools and Enrolled Students by Type of Meal Program

SFA Director Survey Findings		Recommendations
8	**A13** The question "Does your SFA receive a SBP severe need subsidy?" implies that it is asking about all schools in the SFA. One respondent said the subsidy is provided on a per school basis. One respondent did not know what "SBP severe need subsidy" meant and had to Google it.	■ Revise A13: "Do any schools within your SFA receive a SBP severe need subsidy? ■ Provide a definition of the subsidy in question A13, in the same manner a definition is provided in A12 for the 60% subsidy.
9	**A14** Respondents whose SFAs included CEP schools struggled a bit with this item that asks for the number of meals claimed for reimbursement by program type (NSLP and SBP) for the entire SFA. One respondent wondered if he should include meals claimed from the CEP schools in the "# of Free Meals Claimed" column. Another felt that the column categories do not make sense for an SFA that is 100 percent CEP. The respondent said, "We don't claim free meals, reduced price meals or paid meals, we just claim meals."	■ If possible, use programming to tailor the column headers based on whether respondents have CEP schools in their SFAs.
10	**B1** B1 begins with an explanation of what happens under Provision 2 and 3. One respondent didn't understand the requirements for Provision 2 and 3 schools, noting that explanations describe what the reimbursements are based on, not what qualifications the school or SFA must meet to use either of the Provisions. She looked it up on her state's (Indiana) Department of Education website, where she said she found a brief definition that explained the qualifications clearly.	■ Revise the definitions of Provision 2 and 3 to include the qualifications a school must meet to use them.
11	**B2** Four respondents had trouble selecting a response option as the primary reason their SFA does not participate in Provision 2 or 3. Two of the four noted they do not participate because CEP is a better option for their schools. One of them explained that he didn't feel like any of the response options fit his situation because "everybody's using Community Eligibility." The other said it would be easiest to answer in the "other" category rather than selecting option 4 "Provision 2 or 3 is not economically beneficial or appropriate for our schools." The two others were unfamiliar with Provision 2 and 3 and did not know why they do not participate. One of those two also had CEP schools and was sure they don't qualify for Provision 2 or 3 but did not know why.	■ Add a response option that allows respondents to indicate that they're using CEP instead of Provision 2 or 3, such as the example one respondent provided, "Community Eligibility (CEP) is a better option for our schools."
12	**C1** Three respondents said they would have difficulty selecting a response option about their SFA's participation in CEP. One	■ Move the last response option, "No participation in CEP" to the top of the list so

SFA Director Survey Findings	Recommendations
respondent felt that there is no option for SFAs that serve more than one district where there's a "mixed bag" of CEP and non-CEP districts. "It doesn't allow you to say I have one LEA that's 100% and this other situation for these other LEAs." Another respondent in a district with only one group of schools said the third response option "only groups of schools within LEAs?" confused her because it said "LEAs" in plural form. Yet another respondent was unfamiliar with the term LEA. She has only one district and no CEP schools and said she would skip the item.	that respondents for whom the rest of the response options don't apply can quickly find their answer. ■ Provide definitions for SFA and LEA No other recommendations for revising this item. It's unclear why the other respondents couldn't fit their situations to the existing response options, since the list seems to be mutually exclusive and exhaustive, and does include options for the situations they described along with a place to answer for "other" kinds of situations.
13 C2 Question C2 asks for the primary reason the SFA did not elect CEP for any schools. One respondent wanted a response option that explained they participate in Provision 2 or 3.	■ Add a response option to C2: "Provision 2 or 3 is a better option for our schools."
14 D2 & D3 D2 and D3 ask for start and end dates for the school year for the sampled schools. One respondent pointed out that D1 through D3 are repetitive if the response at A4 is "yes" (all schools start and end on the same date) and dates are provided in A5 & A6.	■ Skip respondents out of D1 through D4 if they answered "yes" in A4 and provided dates in A5 and A6.
15 D11 D11 asks if a school participates in CEP with the entire LEA. Two respondents found the survey's use of both "SFA" and "LEA" confusing. One respondent, with an SFA that serves two districts, said it would make more sense to ask D11 about her SFA.	■ Replace SFA with LEA in D11 as below. D11. "Is <INSERT CEP SCHOOL NAME> participating in CEP with the entire SFA, as an individual school or as part of a group of schools?"
16 E3 and E4 E3 and E4 ask about the types of technical assistance available. One respondent explained that it would be hard to select one type of	■ Program E3 and E4 for "Check all that apply."

SFA Director Survey Findings	Recommendations
assistance since they often provide all types of assistance.	
17 E7 This question asks about number of staff with responsibility for reviewing applications and "determining certification status." Some respondents said it's confusing to use the word "certification" because it calls to mind "direct certification." Two respondents commented that they hire temporary help for a short period of time at the beginning of the school year. They were unsure if they should count the temporary workers.	■ Use additional clarifying language for certification in this section
18 E9 This question asks how long certification status is extended into the current school year. Three respondents pointed out that the requirement to extend eligibility is for 30 days and that 30 days is not 1 month. Two respondents said the time period was closer to 6 weeks. One of them said she would have to decide between the response options for 1 or 2 months.	■ Revise E9 to include response options that accurately reflect the SFA requirement to extend eligibility for 30 days. Provide clarifying language for "certification". 　■ Less than 30 days 　■ 30 days 　■ More than 30 days 　■ Until a certain date (specify) 　■ Some other time period (specify)

SFA Director Survey Findings		Recommendations
19	**E10 & E12** Eight respondents were asked if they would be more likely to enter a long, detailed response or a short, general response to these open-ended questions about the application and certification process. All 8 respondents who were asked said their open-ended responses to E10 and E12 would be short. One said the answers would be just 2 to 4 sentences. Another said she could answer by giving 6-8 simple points about what she does.	■ Leave items as they are. Because the size of the answer space is a visual clue to respondents about the length of the answer they're expected to provide, display space appropriate for a brief paragraph, or up to 5-6 sentences of description.
20	**E12** Four respondents did not understand what this question is asking ("How are the household's responses about their application recorded?"). One, who was also confused about the use of "certification" in E8, E9, and E10, also wondered if this question was also about certification, or if it referred to the questions that households sometimes write on their applications. Another wondered what part of the process the question was about, "the letter of eligibility or what?" Another was confused by the word "responses" in the question. She said responses given "on" the application are recorded but not responses "about" the application, such as comments or complaints. One respondent didn't know if the question refers to the calls she makes to households regarding a question about their application or if it is refers to the denial letters she sends to households that don't qualify.	■ Revise E12 so that it is more clearly linked to E11, which is about processing households' applications: "Once a household is contacted regarding questions about their application, how are their answers about their application recorded?"
21	**Section F: Direct Certification for Non CEP Schools** One respondent with a "100% CEP SFA" felt that this section should apply to his SFA since "direct certification without application, that's the heart of what we do." If asked, he would answer "yes" to F1.	■ Leave as is; this section is designed for Non CEP SFAs. ■ Add questions on State and District level matching to the CEP section.
22	**Section G: Verification** On the paper version it is not clear if SFAs with 100% of their schools as CEP schools will automatically skip this section about the verification process.	■ Program a skip for Section G for SFAs with 100% of their schools as CEP schools and insert skip language on paper copies.
23	**H1** H1 asks about manual and automated processes for meal counting and claiming. Two respondents questioned the order of H1a, b, and c. One felt that "b" (Point of sale meal counting) should come before "a" (SFA preparation and submission of meal reimbursement claims to state agency) because it happens first. Another felt that "a"	■ Revise the order of items in H1 to match the real-time order of steps for meal counting and claiming. a. Point of sale meal

SFA Director Survey Findings		Recommendations
	should come after "c" (School preparation of meal counts submitted to SFA) because the first step is getting claim data from the Cafeteria Manager then that data are sent to the state.	counting b. School preparation of meal counts submitted to SFA c. SFA preparation and submission of meal reimbursement claims to state agency
24	**H2** H2 is an open-ended question about ensuring accuracy of meal counting and claiming. Five of the six respondents who were asked about this question said their open-ended responses to H2 would be short, perhaps a couple of sentences, or a couple short paragraphs. Just one was not sure how much detail was being requested and said the description "could get very lengthy." He suggested asking "What error checks do you have in place?"	■ Leave item as is. Because the size of the answer space is a visual clue to respondents about the length of the answer they're expected to provide, display space appropriate for a brief paragraph, or up to 5-6 sentences of description.
25	**I1 and I5** These items ask about training "during the past 12 months." Respondents were probed on what time period they would consider when answering these items. Five of the 6 who were asked this probe said "the last 12 months" as instructed. Several noted that it makes sense since training is done annually. One respondent didn't notice the instructions and said "the last school year" when probed.	■ Leave items as they are. ■ Ask follow-up question(s) for any SFA Director who answers "no"
26	**I3** Item I3 asks about the topics that are covered in training. Respondents made suggestions to revise and add to the training topics listed.	■ Include the following additional training topics to I3: 　■ The meal line training 　■ "Smart Snacks" training ■ Revise response option #7: 　■ Approval for meal benefits
27	**I4** This question asks "What types of staff received your training?" One respondent made a suggestion to add "Food Service Director" to the response option list.	■ Add "Food Service Director" to the list of staff who received training. ■ Revise question to

SFA Director Survey Findings	Recommendations
	remove "your".
28 I5 I5 asks about technical assistance received from the State Agency. Two respondents asked what is meant by "technical assistance." One asked if it means calling with a question and also wondered if the required web-based training should be included. Another thinks of "technical assistance" as in-person, on-site training and also wondered if it included the continuing education all administrators receive at the state conference.	■ Add a definition of "technical assistance" in I5.
29 I9 and I10 These questions are about school visits. Two respondents were confused about "who" the questions assume are visiting. "Who are we asking that was visiting? That probably would need to be a little more specific." She did not know if the questions were asking if she visits each site as the SFA, or someone else. She explained that she conducts visits to each of the 4 schools in her district daily. Another respondent was not sure if the question was asking about her or the state.	■ Revise question language to clarify who is doing the visiting. ■ Revise question to clarify that the visit is specifically for monitoring (and define monitoring). I9. "How many schools does your SFA visit in a typical year?" I10. "What percentage of all the schools in the SFA are visited by your SFA?"
30 I12 I12 asks "Is there a records review component that is conducted remotely?" One respondent explained that "for us there's no remote because we're one school." Another did not know what it meant. She said she would answer "yes" because "we can't over claim free and reduced students when you're only approved for so many…, that would be remotely from my computer, it wouldn't be done at the school." Another was generally confused, "I don't know what a records review is."	■ Provide text that clarifies what is meant by "review component" and "remotely" in this question.
31 Wrap Up – "Are you aware of errors or mistakes in the certification and meal claiming processes in your district?" One respondent believes errors are introduced because parents are not always truthful and the SFA does not or cannot follow-up to verify parents' claims. One respondent suggested adding a question about whether any errors were found during an audit. One respondent, with 3 schools under 1 roof, also serves as the Cafeteria Manager. She said the only errors that could occur are when a student doesn't take the complete reimbursable meal. She knows when that happens and stops it "99% of the time." She either	■ No recommendations. The issue of errors is addressed in the in-depth interview. The other two comments are informational, not requiring survey revision.

SFA Director Survey Findings	Recommendations
asks the child to come back and get what they need or records it and reduces her total number by that student who didn't take the full meal.	

2.2 Feasibility Interviews: SFA Director In-depth Interview Guide

SFA Director In-depth Interview Findings	Recommendation
32 Section A: Application Certification Errors and Section B: Direct Certification Errors. All 3 respondents commented that questions in these sections felt repetitive and during questioning gave information that overlapped between sections. One respondent had already answered all items in Section B when answering Section A. Another could not answer most of the questions for Section B because they were not applicable to her district. SFA Directors seemed reluctant to admit errors, or unaware of the errors being made, so the focus on errors and similar phrasing of questions often did not yield new information.	■ Replace the word "certification" with a more appropriate phrase such as "approved for" (or some variation of it such as determined eligible by application) in Section A. ■ Section B is currently lacking any introductory text. Insert text to highlight the transition and clarify the difference between A and B. "We just finished covering your district's process for certifying applications. Now let's focus on the direct certification process."
33 Section A, Question 4 "What changes, if any have there been over time in the types and extent of errors that occur in the certification process? If so, what kinds of things have contributed to those changes?" Two respondents said this question was redundant, and had already answered in previous items.	■ Leave question as is; it is asking about change over time and is not redundant. We will provide clarification or an interview probe on how this question is distinct.
34 Section C. CEP/ISP Errors Of the two SFA directors who received these items, interviewers noted that the transition was abrupt and that adding language explaining the new section would help with flow. One respondent asked what an ISP rate was.	■ Add transition language before questioning: "Now let's talk about your ISP rate and the sources you use to determine it." ■ Provide definition for ISP rate.

SFA Director In-depth Interview Findings	Recommendation
35 **Section D. Meal Claiming Errors** Respondents were unsure what part of the process "meal claiming" was. ■ Two respondents had difficulty understanding what this section was about because they did not call this step "meal claiming," despite the explanation in the introductory text. ■ One respondent asked for clarification and called this moment "point of service." Another considered "meal claiming" to be the time when claims are keyed and reported after meals have been distributed, "when I actually am going to submit my claim." She called the moment at the cash register, "identifying reimbursable meals."	■ Revise the introductory text to further clarify what is meant by "meal claiming," as below. "Meal claiming is the point at which cafeteria staff identify meals as reimbursable or not reimbursable. Meal claiming errors occur at the end of the serving line, after a student has filled his or her tray, typically at the point of sale or cash register"
36 **Section E. Training** **Intro text: Now I'd like to learn more about training and guidance for SFA staff.** In one small school district the SFA Director was the only staff member involved in the certification process so reading "SFA staff" was awkward.	■ Change text to allow interviewer to read either "SFA staff" or "you."
37 **Section E. Training** **Q5 "What type of training or guidance does the person who is in charge of the meal counting and claiming receive?"** ■ Two respondents were not sure how to answer and had to ask for clarification about which person this question is referring to. One needed to clarify if the intention was a person at the site, at the central office, or at the state. The phrasing, "In charge of meal counting and claiming" did not make sense for her. ■ Another respondent was not sure if training meant the administrative training she had received as an SFA Director or the training for cashiers in her schools.	■ Revise the question so it's asked in two parts, first to learn from the respondents' view who is in charge of meal counting and claiming, then to learn what training that person receives. "Who completes the meal counting and claiming paperwork?" ■ "What type of training or guidance does that person receive about how to complete the meal counting and claiming paperwork?"

2.3 Feasibility Interviews: Cafeteria Manager In-depth Interview Guide

Cafeteria Manager In-depth Inteview Findings	Recommendation
38 Global Issues Items were repetitive causing interviewers to either skip questions or respondents to repeat information they had already given. ■ For both respondents training came up organically while answering questions in the first three sections. Probing further at the time the respondent mentioned training would have allowed for more natural flow than waiting until the end of the interview to repeat subject matter. ■ Conceptual boundaries between Sections A and B seemed unclear to one respondent who focused her answers on how they track which students get free, reduced, or paid meals when responding for both sections.	■ Allow interviewers to move around in the protocol and ask questions out of order, or skip questions if they have already been answered.
39 Section A, Q4 "What are some challenges to knowing if a meal is reimbursable?" Q4 is repetitive and elicits information already given. Two respondents had already provided this information in Questions 1 and 3.	■ Move Q4, Section A to an "if needed" probe in Q1.
40 Section A. Serving Meals and Section B. Recording Reimbursable Meals Section A starts vaguely so that respondents have difficulty focusing their answers. Content potentially overlaps with Section B in respondents' understanding. ■ One respondent answered about recording meals during the serving section. The interviewer needed to emphasize "serving" to keep the respondent focused when answering. ■ Both interviewers needed to use all probes for Question 1 because respondents were not providing the type of information being sought.	Better define Sections A and B to direct respondents to desired subject matter. To help respondents better distinguish between sections, change introductory text for each section to emphasize serving and recording meals respectively. ■ Introduce Section A with text, "I'd like to learn more about the process of serving reimbursable meals. Let's start there." ■ Introduce Section B with, "Now let's talk about the process of *recording* a reimbursable meal. We would like to better understand how a student's meal could be missing some necessary components and still be recorded as reimbursable."
41 Section D. Staff Training One respondent declined to answer several probes for Question 1. He did not feel comfortable answering because he did not want to give negative feedback about his supervisors. He commented, "You say nothing gets back, but you don't want to throw your superiors under the bus."	■ Add brief text to the introductory section reminding respondents their answers will not be shared, will not affect their job or their school district, and will be used to help make improvements.

2.4 Feasibility Interviews: Household In-depth Interview Guide

Household In-depth Interview Findings	Recommendation and Justification
42 **Global** Web-based applications are designed differently across school districts. Both interviewers and respondents had difficulty quickly navigating the differing formats. ■ One web-based application could not be viewed in its entirety; instead the applicant had to enter information section by section. The interviewer had difficulty following along with the respondent as she entered information into each screen. Entering fake data to keep up with the respondent did not always land the interviewer on the same screen as the respondent. ■ One respondent had difficulty finding the appropriate sections in a PDF of her electronic application. The interviewer needed to guide her to the correct section.	■ To mitigate potential navigational issues during interviews about online applications, print screen shots for interviewers to reference. Also, develop and have interviewers give to respondents step-by-step navigation instructions for online applications, to ensure respondents land on the screens that are relevant to the interview questions.
43 **Global** Numbering restarts frequently, sometimes within the same section.	■ For ease of interviewer use, number items sequentially from the beginning to the end of the questionnaire.
44 **Section A. Experience Completing the Application** **Q2 – IF NO: How did you choose to ask the person you just mentioned?** Probe was awkward to administer.	■ Reword this part of the question as: "What made you think of that person/those people?"
45 **Section A. Experience Completing the Application** **Q3 – How much time did you have from when you first received the application to when it had to be turned in? In your opinion, was it enough time to gather the information you needed to complete the application?** ■ One respondent answered "the next day," saying how quickly she completed the application rather than how much time she was given to do it. ■ Two questions are read in succession making it difficult for respondents to answer both. ■ The wording "received" and "turned in" implies a hard copy application which is inaccurate if the person completed an on-line application.	Rephrase the first sentence to emphasize the time that respondents were given to return the application and remove language that suggests a paper application was used. ■ Display the second question as a sub-question so that the two are read and answered separately: "How much time were you given to complete and submit the application?" a. "In your opinion, was it enough time to gather the information you needed to complete the application?"
46 **Section A: Experience Completing the Application** **Q1C (pg. 2).** If so, why did you choose to fill out the application on-line? This wording makes it sound as if the respondent needs to justify his or her decision.	■ In general it's good practice to avoid the word "why" when asking for reasons people engage in any given behavior. It can evoke a defensive reaction, or imply that there's a "right" answer. Reword this part of the

Household In-depth Interview Findings	Recommendation and Justification
	question as: "What made you decide to fill out the application on-line?"
47 **Section A: Experience Completing the Application** **Q1D (pg. 2).** Were you able to complete the application over time or did it have to be done in one sitting? This wording assumes the respondent completed the application over time. The one respondent who completed the application online did so in one sitting, and was not sure if she would have been able to save and come back.	■ Reword as: "Did you complete the application over time or all in one sitting?" ■ If respondent reports completing the application all in one sitting, ask: "Do you think you would have been able to leave and come back if you needed to?"
48 **Section B: Understanding Application Components** **Q2 –** Let me ask about a couple of types of income that can be confusing to people. If you were to receive income from child support would you enter that information in the income box? Explain. What about income and alimony payments? Explain. Income from public assistance? Explain. One respondent was not a native English speaker and relatively new to the United States. She was not familiar with the terms "child support," "alimony," and "public assistance." The interviewer had to provide extensive explanations for the respondent to understand.	Have definitions for terms ready for interviewers to use in case respondents need more explanation including: ■ Child support; ■ Alimony; ■ Public assistance; and ■ Worker's compensation. ■ Add Probe: if the respondent does need an explanation, first ask what they think the terms mean before providing the definition.
49 **Section B: Understanding Application Components, Listing Income** **Q1 probe:** Was it unclear as to whether the income needed to be before or after taxes and other deductions? This probe was very important for the respondent who was not a native English speaker. She initially was confident in her response, but after receiving this probe had to think through what gross and net income mean. The application she completed switched between asking for gross and net, which she found confusing.	■ To better assess income reporting and whether respondents understand the differences between gross and net income make this a required question and not an "if needed" probe. ■ Revise question to read: "Was it clear whether the income you reported needed to be before or after taxes and other deductions?"
50 **Section B: Understanding Application Components, Listing Income** **Q4 –** Now I'm going to read you the application instructions about reporting a child's income. [INTERVIEWER READ INSTRUCTIONS ON APPLICATION]. Based on those instructions… In two applications the instructions to be inserted into the question were long and awkward for the interviewer to read in full.	■ Have interviewers direct respondents to the instructions in the application and allowing them to read to themselves. Interviewers could prompt with the first sentence or two if necessary.

2.5 Cognitive Interviews: Household Survey

Household Survey Findings	Recommendations
51 **Section B: Participating in School Breakfast and Lunch Programs.** This section begins with a definition of school meals served through the school breakfast and lunch programs. Interviewers found B1 lengthy and repetitive to read. Specifically, the word "school" or "schools" appears up to 8 times in 4 sentences; "meals" appears 4 times; and the words "breakfast" and "lunch" appear 3 times.	■ Revise the text so that it is more concise and less repetitive. B1. "The next questions are about the meals TARGET STUDENT eats at school. I am going to ask about whether your child had a school breakfast or lunch each day during the last full week of school. I am referring to the meals provided under the School Breakfast and School Lunch Program. They are the meals that are on the menu for free or a single price, as opposed to individual foods, such as salads, meats, and desserts that are priced and bought separately."
52 **Section B: Participating in School Breakfast and Lunch Programs.** Questions about daily school attendance and participation in the school breakfast and lunch program were repetitive when the respondent states that the student attended or ate breakfast/lunch at school every day of the week. Interviewers went off script several times and recorded responses based on respondents' overall statement about the entire week. All interviewers agreed that administering the items by date were at times repetitive.	■ Allow interviewers to enter data for each date when respondents make statements about the entire week.
53 **Section B: Participating in School Breakfast and Lunch Programs.** The questions ask for the dates of the last full week of school and student attendance on each date. Interviewers had some difficulty going through the days and dates of the prior week without the help of a calendar.	■ Field interviewers will have a CAPI instrument programmed to fill the dates based on the answer to B2. In addition, provide field interviewers with a calendar for reference.
54 **Section C: Perception of School Meals.** The questions in this section ask about student and parent satisfaction with school meals. Respondents have difficulty with Section C questions when they have different answers for school breakfasts versus school lunches. The questions are not broken down separately by breakfast and lunch as done in Section B. ■ Two respondents had difficulty answering because they didn't know if the question was asking about breakfast or lunch. ■ One child liked the lunches but not the breakfasts. ■ One parent felt differently about the "healthfulness"	■ Ask separate questions for breakfast and lunch on questions C1a, C1b, and C2a.

Household Survey Findings	Recommendations
of the breakfasts and the lunches served.	
55 **Section C Response Lists** For smoother reading, cognitive interviewers spontaneously inserted "or" after "Somewhat dissatisfied" in the response list.	■ Add "or" after "Somewhat dissatisfied" in the response list. For all questions where the response options are read aloud, be sure they are scripted conversationally for ease of interviewer administration.
56 **C1c** Two respondents found C1c (satisfaction with the food program overall) difficult to answer on behalf of their young children (Kindergarten and 4th grade), noting that their children do not even know about the program.	■ Revise C1c to become two questions: 1) asking about food served in the Breakfast Program and 2) asking about food served in the Lunch Program. ■ Same change for C2b.
57 **C2a** In C2a (parent satisfaction with "the healthfulness of the food"), one respondent mis-heard "healthfulness" as "helpfulness" and another heard it as "healthiness."	■ Leave as is.
58 **Section D: Perceptions of the Household Application.** **D1** – For smoother reading, interviewers inserted "or" after "Somewhat difficult" in the response list. Cognitive interviewers did this spontaneously. The more scripted approach used by field interviewers requires revisions.	■ Add "or" after "Somewhat difficult" in the response list.
59 **Section D: Perceptions of the Household Application.** **D5** – The double-barreled question ("Did you request/ need assistance to complete the application?") asks about both a "request" and "need" for assistance in one question. The slash in "request/need" is awkward for the interviewer to administer aloud. ■ Two respondents were probed on whether they were thinking about if they <u>needed</u> assistance or <u>requested</u> assistance. Both were thinking about whether they needed assistance. ■ Because items D6 – D8 are about applicants requesting assistance, it is assumed that determining if an applicant requested assistance is an important research objective.	■ Eliminate the "/" in "need/request." Develop two separate questions for "need" and "request." D5. "Did you need assistance to complete the application?" IF YES: D5a. "Did you request assistance to complete the application?"
60 **Section E: Categorical Eligibility.** Question E1 asks about the student's relationship to the respondent. Interviewers do not consistently verify the exact relationship. ■ Interviewers did not consistently verify if the child is adopted, foster, or biological. For example, when a respondents answers "son" or "daughter" some interviewers recorded "NATURAL CHILD" without verification.	■ Provide instructions to the interviewer to read the first three response options to signal the respondent to provide the exact relationship. Instruct the interviewer to continue reading response options until the respondent provides the answer. ■ Train interviewers to probe for exact relationship when respondents' initial answers don't indicate what that is.

Household Survey Findings	Recommendations
61 **Section E: Categorical Eligibility.** E4 asks for application month but not year. Interviewers recorded the year even though it was not requested in the survey item.	■ Revise question to ask about APPLICATION MONTH, YEAR. This is especially important should the survey be conducted in the second half of the school year.
62 **Section E: Categorical Eligibility.** This section begins with an introduction about benefits received through government programs. Then questions E6 and E19 ask if household members receive TANF or SNAP benefits. The questions are followed by a qualifying statement about what not to include. ■ Respondents answered "no" during the introduction of the Household Benefits section, before the questions were asked. Some respondents began to retrieve their documentation at that moment, when it is not necessary to look at the documentation until E7. ■ It was also disruptive for interviewers to read the second sentence of E6 and E19 ("Do not include TANF/SNAP benefits received by another household member with their own TANF/SNAP case number that does not include you, your spouse, and/or your child/children"), which was placed after the question. The respondents answered "yes" or "no" to the question before the second sentence could be read. ■ These issues occurred with four respondents, all of whom answered "no" to E6 and E19.	■ Revise the second sentence of the introduction to more accurately reflect the process, preventing the respondent from showing the interviewer their documentation but informing them they will need it soon before the interviewer administers E6. See the recommendation below. ■ Move the instructions ("Do not include TANF/SNAP benefits received by another household member with their own TANF/SNAP case number that does not include you, your spouse, and/or your child/children") to the introduction of the Household Benefits section, so that it is read prior to question E6 and E19. See the recommendation below. **HOUSEHOLD BENEFITS** The next questions are about benefits received through government programs. Soon we'll need to look at any documentation you have about payments from these programs. Do you have that ready? IF NO, GIVE TIME FOR R TO COLLECT IT INTERVIEWER: WHENEVER POSSIBLE, USE AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS TO VERIFY OR CLARIFY RESPONDENT'S RESPONSES. **TANF BENEFITS** Let's discuss TANF benefits. Do not include TANF benefits received by another household member with their own TANF case number that does not include you, your spouse, and/or your child/children. E6. During [application month and year], did you, or anyone in your household receive Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), also known as cash welfare, or [DC & VA = TANF, MD=Temporary Cash Assistance]?

Household Survey Findings	Recommendations
	SNAP BENEFITS Now let's discuss SNAP benefits. Do not include SNAP benefits received by another household member with their own SNAP case number that does not include you, your spouse, and/or your child/children. E19. During [application month and year], did you, your spouse, and/or child/children) receive Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits (formerly known as Food Stamps), or [DC & VA=SNAP, MD=Food Supplement Program]?
63 **Section E: Categorical Eligibility.** This item instructs the interviewer to record the period ending date on the TANF statement document. Sometimes periodic statements, rather than monthly statements, serve as documentation. The date on the periodic statement might not be reflective of a month. **E11** – The interviewer recorded the date from the periodic statement, which was not a monthly statement. The interviewer did not use the option to circle "**END DATE NOT FOUND ON THE DOCUMENT.**"	■ During interviewer training, include instruction for selecting "END DATE NOT FOUND ON THE DOCUMENT" when the documentation is not a monthly statement.
64 **E20** – The item asks for a statement from the application month and year. This makes it difficult for a respondent that only gets a statement once a year, not monthly.	Revise question to ask for a statement, and add a follow-up question to determine whether the amount on the statement matches that received in the application month and year. ■ E20. "We need to record the total amount (you and your (child/children)/ you and your spouse and (child/children)) received in (State SNAP/SNAP) benefits during [application month and year]. We can get that amount from your SNAP award statement or notification of payment. Do you have a statement or notification of the amount of your monthly benefits?" E20a. "Is that the amount you received in [application month and year]?"

Household Survey Findings	Recommendations
65 **Section F: Household Composition.** **F3 –** Respondents do not consistently exclude themselves from the number of household members reported. ■ Two respondents included themselves. One corrected her response after the interviewer repeated "NOT including yourself."	■ Rephrase question so that "not including yourself" is first: F3. "Not including yourself, how many people live with you?"
66 **Section F: Household Composition.** **F15 –** "Did anyone (else) not currently in this household live with you in [application month and year]?" Some respondents struggled with this item, perhaps in part because it begins with negative phrasing, which can pose a more challenging comprehension task. ■ In one case the respondent asked "not lived with me?" The interviewer repeated the question and the respondent was able to answer "no. ■ In another case the respondent thought it was a different question about visitors. She answered "yes" because her mother was temporarily visiting at the time she completed the application.	■ Revise the question so that it does not begin with a negative. Provide instructions not to include visitors. Move the instruction to the front of the item. F15. "For this next question, do <u>not</u> include temporary visitors. Did anyone (else) live with you in this household in [application month and year] but does not live with you now]?"
67 **Section G: Income and Earning Sources.** Respondents are not familiar with some of the income and earnings sources listed on the Showcard. ■ During probing, some respondents were unfamiliar with Temporary Assistance, Black Lung Benefits, Alimony Payments, Payments from Large Amounts or Settlements, Private Pension, Housing Subsidy, Strike Benefits, Interest and Dividends Income, and General Assistance Benefits.	■ Provide brief definitions for some Showcard items that are commonly reported.
68 **Section G: Income and Earning Sources.** The Worksheet is long and text heavy. ■ One respondent thought the worksheet was easy but not initially. She said, "At first I thought it was so long, like oh my gosh, more reading and more understanding. But once I printed it and started to fill it, it is very easy. It just took one minute or so." ■ Another said "It's really wordy. Just make it quick." The respondent stopped reading after the first row of the second table on page 3. ■ Another wasn't sure about what to do other than write in the name of the income earner.	To the extent possible, streamline the Worksheet and instructions: ■ Delete repetitive phrases or sentences. ■ Delete unnecessary instructions. ■ Reformat tables to fit on one page.

Household Survey Findings	Recommendations
69 **Section H: Income and Earning Amounts.** The Introduction to the section and the initial text in H1, leading up to the question, are very long and difficult to administer. ■ The first paragraph is long and has too many examples. ■ The introduction asks for documentation so it breaks up the flow when the respondent responds to the request. ■ The second sentence of the introduction, "For each type of income you reported," is not applicable when the respondent had just talked about one source of income. ■ The introduction and H1 switch back and forth between asking for documentation, information from the last time paid, and from the application month. ■ The 3rd bullet in H1 "farm or non-farm business" is awkward to read for many respondents' situations.	Streamline the introduction and initial text of H1. ■ Delete some examples from the first paragraph ■ Delete the first part of the second sentence "For each type of income you reported." ■ Revise language to consistently ask for application month and year.
70 **Section H: Income and Earning Amounts.** **H2 –** This question asks "How often are these earnings paid to (you/person's name)?" Two respondents said "bi-weekly," but the response option says "every two weeks."	■ Revise the response option to: EVERY TWO WEEKS (BI-WEEKLY).
71 **Section H: Income and Earning Amounts.** **H5-H10 –** These items are for the interviewer to document details about the respondent's paid income documentation. The items are difficult to administer if the respondent's documentation is a contract stating the income earner's annual salary rather than a payment statement. ■ H5 has "award letter" as a response option. If this is the same as a contract, revise to "contract or award letter. ■ H6 does not have a response option for salary contract. ■ H7 and H8 refer to the application month which does not work when documentation is a salary contract.	■ Revise H5-H10 to accommodate contract documentation. **H5.** Revise response option: AWARD LETTER/CONTRACT. **H6.** DOES THE PAY STATEMENT REFLECT EARNINGS DURING [APPLICATION MONT], THE CURRENT MONTH, CURRENT YEAR, OR ANOTHER TIME PERIOD? Add CURRENT YEAR as a response option. **H7 & H8.** Add the appropriate skip instruction when annual contract documentation is presented instead of monthly documentation.

Household Survey Findings	Recommendations
72 **Section J: Demographic Characteristics.** **J8 –** This question asks "How long have you lived in the United States?" One respondent answered "6 years" immediately after hearing the question. Then, after hearing the probe "*Include the total number of years/months living in the United States. The time does not need to be consecutive,*" she changed her answer to 4 years and 6 months, subtracting the time for the two visits to her home country (once for 1 year and again for 5 months). She explained that when she heard the word "consecutive" she thought of "continuous" which made her think she was to report the amount of time "in total" that she had lived in the United States.	Include "IF NEEDED" before probe and eliminate the second sentence of the probe. "Include the total number of years/months living in the United States."