Supporting Statement for OMB Clearance for the Study of Non-Response to the School Meals Application Verification Process - Appendix 27b - Response to NASS Comments

NASS Comment	Response
I. Respondent Universe and Sampling Methods	
The purpose of this study is clearly stated. All terminology and concepts related directly to this study are thoroughly defined and explained. The argument for the usefulness of the results is also well written.	No revision necessary.
There is error associated in the sample selection of convenience method described in the docket. For example, selecting districts based on geography and having the necessary data in a central location. Although as stated this is not a nationally representative study and as long as these procedures are clearly stated in the publication they seem reasonable.	
All of the numbers in Table B 1.1 are clearly described and calculations are shown throughout the document except for how the Target Completed Cases counts were initially determined. It would be helpful to show/describe the calculations for how these numbers were derived for the resulting confidence intervals for the number of districts and households within each sample as was done in the footnote for the Initial Sample.	Confidence intervals were added as footnotes in Table B1.1.
What will happen if 20 of the 25 selected districts can't participate? Will additional districts be selected and if so, how?	The following text was added to Part B, Question 1: "In the event that 20 districts do not agree to participate, the study team will return to the original list of 61 eligible SFAs and, using the methods described above, select additional districts until 20 SFAs have been enrolled."

Supporting Statement for OMB Clearance for the Study of Non-Response to the School Meals Application Verification Process - Appendix 27b - Response to NASS Comments

NASS Comment	Response	
mailed upon receiving a completed questionnaire.	The following text was added to Part A, Question 9: "If permission is granted, interviewers will provide respondents with a \$25 Visa gift card upon completion of the survey to offset these costs and reduce nonresponse bias in the study."	
III. Maximizing Response Rates		
The bulleted plans for maximizing response rates and data quality are described in detail. The plan to send in-person interviews to district and household non-responders will most likely be a useful follow up method.	No revision necessary.	
When contacting participants by phone, if a voicemail will be left or if the participant is busy and prefers to call back, the wording that will be left in a voicemail or as instructions to call back should be documented so all members of the interviewing team will use the same wording and include the same information in their messages.	The Household Survey Call Script (Appendix 29a/b) was updated to include a standardized voicemail message.	
IV. Test of Procedures		
The pretest procedures were well documented and appear to be designed appropriately to collect the necessary information. No other comments for this section.	No revision necessary.	
V. Statistical Methods for Summary		

Supporting Statement for OMB Clearance for the Study of Non-Response to the School Meals Application Verification Process - Appendix 27b - Response to NASS Comments

NASS Comment	Response
L	
The non-response analysis is well described. There was mention of confidence intervals for analysis across districts and	
household. There could be more information on the type of	
results that will be tabulated related to the quantitative side of	
the study. This could be brief if it will just be basic frequencies or cross tabulations, but if there are any plans for more	A new subheading titled "General Analysis Approach" was added to Part B,
complex analysis or summaries, it should be documented.	Question 2.