

MEMO

To: Steph Tatham; Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA), Office of Management and Budget

From: Samantha Illangasekare, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE), Administration for Children and Families (ACF)

Re: **Non-substantive change request for** revisions to data collection protocols, consent form, and recruitment materials for PAIVED project (OMB # 0970-0516)

Date: October 2, 2018

Based on feedback from IRB and our colleagues at the Office of Family Assistance (OFA) program office, as well as project staff trainings on the study protocols, we have made a few minor updates to the Preventing and Addressing Intimate Violence when Engaging Dads (PAIVED) data collection protocols, consent form, and recruitment materials (approved under OMB #0970-0516). This memo outlines each proposed revision and the corresponding rationale. The proposed changes do not increase participant burden and can be considered administrative/non-substantive changes. Tracked and clean versions of the revised documents are attached.

Proposed revisions

General updates

- Changed language from “responsible fatherhood” to “fatherhood” in all study documents.
 - **Rationale:** we are screening non-OFA funded fatherhood programs and realized “responsible fatherhood” is terminology typically used for federally-funded fatherhood programming. This edit makes the language we use inclusive of all programs regardless of funding status.
- Changed “site visit” to “program visit” in all study documents.
 - **Rationale:** the team met with OFA to discuss the project, and they advised us to avoid the term “site visit” as it may suggest a formal visit from funders that requires a lot of preparation on the part of program staff. We want to be clear that our study is not linked to OFA’s funding or oversight, nor does it require preparation beyond scheduling.
- Removed language from recruitment materials that may make programs feel obligated to participate.
 - **Rationale:** OFA informed the study team that despite consent language about voluntary participation, some grantees may feel obligated to participate. We removed or edited language that could exacerbate feelings of obligation to participate from all study materials.
- Named all organizations conducting the study (Child Trends and partners Boston Medical Center and Futures Without Violence) in the consent form.
 - **Rationale:** Boston Medical Center’s IRB requested that their organization be named in the consent form.

Updates to language around participant consent and rights

- Changed language around privacy to specify that grantee organizations will not be named in reports unless we have their permission. We originally said that grantee organizations would not be named in reports.

- o **Rationale:** OFA recommended that we keep the option to name grantee organizations open, as it may benefit the project and the grantees to be able to spotlight successful programs.
- Clarified that participation in the interviews and program visits will not require preparation time.
 - o **Rationale:** because of the conversation with OFA that “site visit” connotes a lot of preparation on the part of grantee staff, the team wanted to state explicitly that participation in the PAIVED study will not require preparation time from program staff, beyond scheduling interviews and visits.

Updates to simplify and clarify language in data collection protocols

- Made the introductory language in the interview and screening protocols more conversational.
 - o **Rationale:** during staff trainings on the study protocols, the consensus was the introductory language in all data collection protocols was long and felt unnatural. We have reduced language when possible and made the language less formal.
- Incorporated consent language in the interview and screening protocols.
 - o **Rationale:** the study team felt that having the consent language incorporated into the introductory language of the data collection protocols would make the flow of conversation better. It will also facilitate documentation of verbal consent.
- Clarified questions and probes in the interview and screening protocols that the team found awkward, cumbersome, unclear, or unnecessary during staff trainings.
 - o **Rationale:** one goal of the staff trainings was to clarify the intent of each question in the interview and screening protocols. Through this process, the team made edits to interview and screening questions, as needed, to ensure consistency in data collection across interviewers.

Updates to interviewer instructions

- Specified what questions we want interviewers to prioritize if interviews run long and it is not possible to ask all questions.
 - o **Rationale:** to prepare for the possibility that some interviewees will be very talkative, difficult to redirect, or need to end the interview early, the team discussed the most important questions that should be prioritized during interviews. Each data collection protocol now includes interviewer notes about priority questions. We have also added notes about when to move on to important sections if time is running short.