



October 24, 2018

MEMORANDUM

To: Robert Sivinski, OMB
From: Chris Chapman, NCES
Through: Kashka Kubzdela, NCES
RE: Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology (FCSM) Integrated Data Product Documentation Customer Feedback (IDPF) Revision (OMB# 1880-0542)

The Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology (FCSM) is a Federal interagency committee dedicated to improving the quality of Federal statistics. The FCSM was created by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to inform and advise OMB and the Interagency Council on Statistical Policy (ICSP) on methodological and statistical issues that affect the quality of Federal data. As part of an initiative to improve information made available to the public about how federal statistical agencies integrate data from multiple sources into single data products, FCSM is seeking to collect information from current users of such data products about the utility of the available data documentation. Such information is essential to understanding user experiences and to improving the documentation. The combined information will be summarized in an internal government report to ICSP. The request to conduct the FCSM Integrated Data Product Documentation Customer Feedback (IDPF) survey in 2018 was made (and approved on September 13, 2018) under OMB# 1880-0542 because (1) the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) within the U.S. Department of Education (ED) is contributing to, and will benefit directly from, the data collection effort. Additionally, respondents will be asked for feedback on products provided by: (2) the Economic Research Service (ERS) within the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), (3) the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) within the U.S. Department of Commerce, (4) the National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics (NCSES) within the National Science Foundation (NSF), (5) the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) within the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), and (6) the National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics (NCVAS) within the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). Results from the survey will be combined with information provided by the agencies about the content of the documentation they make available and the resources that go into producing it. This request is to modify portions of the survey.

The changes described in this document do not affect the estimated respondent burden or the total cost to the federal government for this study. Revisions to the content of the approved submission documents (Volumes 1 and 2) are reflected in tracked changes below.

Volume 1 – Supporting Statement

(Background and Study Rationale: p.1)

~~Agencies can~~ NCSES and ERS have planned for additional questions specific to their respective agencies (as shown in sub-sections G of Volume 2, on pages 8-9 and 15). Participating agencies may add their own items at the end of the IDPF survey that are specific to their chosen data product. ~~These~~ In such cases, the added items will be submitted for OMB approval as a revision to this submission or the agency specific items will go to no more than 9 respondents who are not federal government employees.

Volume 2 – Instruments and Communication Materials

(p.3 in *Researcher* and p.10 in *Informed Consumer* version of the survey)

This survey is administered by General Services Administration (GSA) on behalf of {fill agency name} and should take 30 minutes to complete. You have been provided a unique survey link and can enter the survey as many times as needed until submitted. **You have two weeks to fill out this survey before the window closes.** Please respond by {fill date due}.

(p.4 in *Researcher* and p.11 in *Informed Consumer* version of the survey)

A12. Have you read documentation for, **or contacted the agency to obtain information about** {name of product}?

Examples of documentation include a stand-alone technical report describing the data, appendixes or technical notes to other documents that use the data, web-pages about the data, or contacts with agency staff?

- No Go To End
- Yes, **only read documentation**
- Yes, **read documentation and contacted agency staff**
- Yes, **only contacted agency staff**

(pp.8-9 in *Researcher* [G numbered questions] and p.16 in *Informed Consumer* version of the survey [I numbered questions])

~~G1. to be determined~~

~~G2. to be determined~~

For ERS respondents:

G1. Using only the public documentation enclosed with this survey (that is, relying on Muth et al. Understanding IRI Household-Based and Store-Based Scanner Data (2016) alone, and excluding other, non-public documentation that may be available to you as a user authorized to access confidential IRI data), how confident are you that the documentation would be adequate for you to determine the appropriateness of using the IRI data for a future research project?

Please use a 5-point scale to respond where “1” is “Very unconfident”, “2” is “Somewhat unconfident”, “3” is “Neither confident nor unconfident”, “4” is “Somewhat confident” and “5” is “Very confident.” If you do not know the answer, please indicate not applicable “NA.”

Rating

G2. What issues or questions related to the quality or statistical properties of the IRI data—or the appropriateness of using them for specific areas of research—are not currently addressed in the enclosed documentation that would be useful to potential IRI users?

For NCSES respondents:

G1. Please evaluate the Secure Data Access Facility in terms of its usefulness in accessing SESTAT data. Please rate its usefulness using a 5-point scale. A “1” is “Very dissatisfied”, “2” is “Somewhat dissatisfied”, “3” is “Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied”, “4” is “Somewhat satisfied” and “5” is “Very satisfied.” If you do not know the answer or an item does not apply to you, please indicate not applicable “NA.”

Rating
