

Coparenting and Healthy Relationship and Marriage Education for Dads (CHaRMED)

OMB Information Collection Request (New Collection)

Supporting Statement

Part A

December 2019

Submitted By:
Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (OPRE)
Administration for Children and Families (ACF)
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

4th Floor, Mary E. Switzer Building
330 C Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20201

Project Officer:
Nicole Constance, ACF/OPRE

**Alternative Supporting Statement for Information Collections Designed for
Research, Public Health Surveillance, and Program Evaluation Purposes**

Part A

Executive Summary

- **Type of Request:** This Information Collection Request is a new request. We are requesting one year of approval.

- **Description of Request:** The purpose of the Coparenting and Healthy Marriage and Relationship Education for Dads (CHaRMED) study is to better understand the services that federal and non-federal fatherhood programs provide in the areas of Healthy Marriage and Relationship Education (HMRE) and coparenting to learn what strategies hold promise for promoting fathers' active engagement in these services. The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) has contracted with Child Trends, who will lead this work by conducting semi-structured interviews with fatherhood program staff, community partners, nonparticipating fathers, and curriculum developers; and through focus groups with current program participants (fathers) and coparents. For the purpose of this study, nonparticipating fathers are fathers who are currently enrolled in a fatherhood program but never received coparenting or marriage/romantic relationship education services; are currently enrolled in a fatherhood program and received coparenting or marriage/romantic relationship education services but dropped out of these services before they were complete; or are no longer enrolled in a fatherhood program and stopped the program before completing coparenting or marriage/romantic relationship education services. The data collected will be drawn from a sample of federally-funded Responsible Fatherhood (RF) grantees and non-RF fatherhood programs. The findings are meant to inform efforts to promote healthy romantic relationships and coparenting among the broad (federal and non-federal) field of fatherhood programming. The data collection is not intended to produce statistically generalizable results. We do not intend for this information to be used as the principal basis for public policy decisions.

- **Time Sensitivity:** We need to begin data collection by spring 2020. The current cohort of federally-funded RF grantees, our primary target population, is in the final year of a five-year grant cycle. Spring 2020 is just before the grant period for this cohort ends in September of 2020. If we do not begin data collection in spring 2020, we risk grantees ending their programming and/or changing programming and services at the start of a new grant (if they are funded through a future grant cycle) prior to the completion of proposed data collection activities.

Alternative Supporting Statement for Information Collections Designed for Research, Public Health Surveillance, and Program Evaluation Purposes

A1. Necessity for Collection

There are no legal or administrative requirements that necessitate this collection. ACF is undertaking the collection at the discretion of the agency. ACF seeks approval for information collection (IC) activities as part of their effort to better understand the services that fatherhood programs are providing to support fathers' healthy coparenting and romantic relationships.

Coparenting relationships refer to fathers' relationships with the mother(s) of their children or others that play a significant role in helping to parent or raise their children. Romantic relationships refer to fathers' relationships with people they are dating, committed to, or married to, whether they are having sex or not. Although romantic relationship and coparenting services are commonly offered among both federally-funded and non-federally funded fatherhood programs, recent federal evaluations have found that these services are not highly attended by program participants (Avellar, Covington, Moore, Patnaik, & Wu, 2018). To date, it is unclear whether fathers use healthy romantic and coparenting relationship services less than other services because they lack interest (or have more salient needs) and/or because the services they receive are insufficient. There is therefore a need for policy makers, researchers, and practitioners to better understand how to promote fathers' engagement in these services, how fatherhood programs support fathers' healthy romantic relationships and their coparenting relationships, and how these services can be improved to better meet the needs of fathers and their families.

A2. Purpose

Purpose and Use

The information collected is meant to contribute to the body of knowledge on ACF programs. It is not intended to be used as the principal basis for a decision by a federal decision-maker, and is not expected to meet the threshold of influential or highly influential scientific information.

The authorizing legislation¹ for the Responsible Fatherhood grant program requires programs to provide services in three key activity areas: healthy marriage, responsible parenting, and economic stability. The purpose of this descriptive, exploratory research study is to better understand the services that federal and non-federal fatherhood programs provide to fathers to support their healthy romantic and coparenting relationships.

Through primary data collection, CHaRMED will describe how fatherhood programs currently address healthy romantic relationships and coparenting and how their approaches align (or do not) with the needs of the fathers in their target populations. The data collected will inform ACF and the fatherhood field about potential future directions in Healthy Marriage and Relationship Education (HMRE) and coparenting programming for fathers.

To accomplish this, the study will collect data from fatherhood program staff, community partners, fathers, coparents, and curriculum developers. The data collected will meet the goals of this study by providing multiple perspectives on how fatherhood programs support, and could better support, fathers' healthy romantic and coparenting relationships.

¹ Claims Resolution Act, U.S.C. § 811 (2010)

Alternative Supporting Statement for Information Collections Designed for Research, Public Health Surveillance, and Program Evaluation Purposes

The information will improve ACF’s understanding of fatherhood programs’ intended approaches for addressing healthy romantic relationships and coparenting, and will inform ACF’s technical assistance to fatherhood programs on how to better support participants’ healthy romantic and coparenting relationships. The study is also intended to inform the broader field of fatherhood research and programming by providing information about promising strategies for promoting healthy romantic relationships and coparenting among fathers.

Research Questions or Tests

This study has multiple research questions (see **Appendix A. Table of Objectives, Questions, and Respondents**) designed to address three overarching objectives:

- 1) To describe the current approaches fatherhood programs use to support fathers’ healthy relationships (romantic and coparenting).
- 2) To explore the extent to which programs’ current approaches to supporting fathers’ healthy relationships (romantic and coparenting) align with participants’ needs around their relationships.
- 3) To identify promising fatherhood program implementation strategies for healthy romantic and coparenting relationship services, including strategies around recruitment, retention, and engagement.

Study Design

The CHaRMED study is designed to collect information from fatherhood programs (both federally-funded RF grantees and non-RF programs). The study has three main recruitment or data collection components: **recruitment/screening**; **individual interviews** with fatherhood program staff, partner organization staff, nonparticipating fathers, and curriculum developers; and **focus groups** with participating fathers and coparents associated with the fathers in the programs. A **brief questionnaire** will be administered to fathers and coparents during their interviews or focus groups (see Table 1 below for details). The team will also collect information through program observations at select sites. A summary of the types of information to be assessed through the program observations is included in **Appendix C. Program Observation Protocol**.

Table 1. Data Collection Components

| <i>Data Collection Activity</i> | <i>Instrument(s)</i> | <i>Respondent, Content, Purpose of Collection</i> | <i>Mode and Duration</i> |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Recruitment/screening | Instrument 1 – screener for selecting fatherhood program visit sites | Respondents: Program Directors Content/purpose: series of questions to assess fit/relevance of programming | Mode: Telephone interviews Duration: 30 minutes (this estimate accounts for the telephone screening only. For selected sites, we estimate an additional 5.5 hours will be needed for program visit scheduling and logistics) |
| Individual Interviews | Instrument 2 – semi-structured interviews with fatherhood program staff | Respondents: Program Directors and Facilitators Content/purpose: | Mode: In-person interviews Duration: 90 minutes for the interview and up to 30 minutes for scheduling. |

**Alternative Supporting Statement for Information Collections Designed for
Research, Public Health Surveillance, and Program Evaluation Purposes**

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | series of questions to assess program staff perceptions of HMRE/coparenting services, father engagement in services, and what could be improved | |
| Individual Interviews | Instrument 3 – semi-structured interviews with partner organization staff | Respondents: Program Partner Staff Content/purpose: series of questions to assess partner staff perceptions of HMRE/coparenting services, father engagement in services, and what could be improved | Mode: In-person interviews Duration: 90 minutes for the interview and up to 30 minutes for scheduling. |
| Individual Interviews | Instrument 4 – semi-structured interviews with nonparticipating fathers | Respondents: Nonparticipating fathers Content/purpose: series of questions to assess nonparticipating fathers’ perceptions of HMRE/coparenting services, why they stopped attending these services, and what could be improved | Mode: In-person interviews Duration: 60 minutes for the interview and up to 30 minutes for scheduling. |
| Focus Groups | Instrument 5 – focus groups with participating fathers | Respondents: Participating fathers Content/purpose: facilitated group discussion about fathers’ experiences in fatherhood programs and how programs could better meet their needs | Mode: In-person focus groups Duration: 90 minutes for the discussion and up to 30 minutes for scheduling. |
| Focus Groups | Instrument 6 – focus groups with coparents | Respondents: Coparents Content/purpose: facilitated group discussion about | Mode: In-person focus groups Duration: 90 minutes for the discussion and up to 30 minutes for scheduling. |

**Alternative Supporting Statement for Information Collections Designed for
Research, Public Health Surveillance, and Program Evaluation Purposes**

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | coparents' experiences and how fatherhood programs engage them in services | |
| Individual Interviews | Instrument 7 – discussions with curriculum developers | Respondents: Curriculum Developers Content/purpose: series of questions to learn more about a specific curriculum and how it can help address healthy romantic or coparenting relationships among fathers | Mode: Telephone interviews Duration: 60 minutes |
| Individual Interviews/Focus Groups | Instrument 8 – brief questionnaire – fathers | Respondents: Fathers (participating and nonparticipating) Content/purpose: series of questions to collect demographic and family information about study participants to contextualize focus group and interview findings | Mode: Self-administered questionnaires Duration: 15 minutes |
| Focus Groups | Instrument 9 – brief questionnaire – coparents | Respondents: Coparents Content/purpose: series of questions designed to collect demographic and family information about study participants to contextualize focus group findings | Mode: Self-administered questionnaires Duration: 15 minutes |

Before data collection begins, the study team will analyze existing grantee data from grantee applications and performance progress reports as well as publicly available information to help select fatherhood programs to approach for screening (for example, the study team will look at programs' goals and objectives related to HMRE and coparenting content, the curriculum used, whether coparents are included in programming, etc.) and to identify commonly implemented curricula across grantees. The team will also consult with ACF about the programs to approach for study participation (See **SSB. Sampling and Site Selection** for more information).

Alternative Supporting Statement for Information Collections Designed for Research, Public Health Surveillance, and Program Evaluation Purposes

The study team will reach out to program directors at selected fatherhood programs to gauge their interest in participating in the study (see **Appendix B. CHaRMED Email and Phone Scripts** and set up a time for a screening call. The study team anticipates screening up to 20 programs before narrowing to 13 programs for participation². The purpose of the screening call, which will last approximately 30 minutes, is to learn more about the HMRE and coparenting services each program provides, the populations they serve, and when HMRE and/or coparenting programming is occurring. As part of the screening process, directors also will be asked to help identify other participants, specifically additional program directors, program facilitators, and partner organization staff. If the site is selected, directors will be asked to help schedule data collection activities with participants identified during the screening (up to 5.5 additional hours of directors' time).

Fatherhood programs will be selected based on their geographic location, populations served, types of services offered, and relationships with program partner organizations (see **SSB2. Methods and Design** for more information). The study team will select a diverse group of fatherhood programs whose services seem to be reflective of the overall fatherhood program population. Given the qualitative nature of the proposed data collection, the goal of the data collection strategy is not to produce statistically generalizable results. However, the sample will represent a wide range of fatherhood programming in order to provide relevant recommendations to fatherhood programs and other organizations serving fathers.

The study team will set up program visits with each selected fatherhood program to conduct the majority of data collection on-site. In rare cases where a participant is unavailable during the program visit, interviews can be set up via phone if the study team determines that it is critical to the study to include that interview.

Each participant will be interviewed once via a 60-90-minute semi-structured interview or focus group (see **Instruments 2-6**) focus group. The purpose of the questionnaires is to contextualize the qualitative findings from the study by better understanding some basic information about the participants.

Semi-structured telephone interviews with curriculum developers will last up to 60 minutes. The purpose is to better understand the content and purpose of curricula commonly used by fatherhood programs to support fathers' healthy romantic and coparenting relationships (see **Instrument 7. Interview Protocol with Curriculum Developers**). To select curriculum developers, the study team will review grantee data and identify commonly used curricula, supplemented with a broader internet search of appropriate curricula. They will review publicly available information about each curriculum and request interviews with developers of curriculum where information is limited.

Study Limitations. This is a descriptive, qualitative study that will collect information about fatherhood program approaches, implementation strategies, and innovative efforts to engage fathers in HMRE and coparenting programming. It does not assess the outcomes of program services. Findings are not intended to be generalizable to the full population of federally-funded RF programs or fatherhood programs that are not federally-funded. This limitation will be discussed in all printed materials and presentations associated with the study.

² The study team is targeting 13 sites to allow a diverse set of programs to be included in the study while remaining within the pre-determined data collection budget.

Alternative Supporting Statement for Information Collections Designed for Research, Public Health Surveillance, and Program Evaluation Purposes

Other Data Sources and Uses of Information

The information collected will be used in concert with existing data to reduce participant time and burden. Specifically, existing data from grantee applications, semi-annual performance progress reports, program documents, and publicly available curriculum information will be used to help select fatherhood programs for participation and curriculum developers for interviews.

A3. Use of Information Technology to Reduce Burden

The study was designed to minimize participant burden to the extent possible; the only burden to participants will be the time required for study procedures and data collection. To streamline the focus groups and semi-structured interviews as much as possible the study team will use digital audio recorders to record the conversations, if respondents agree to be recorded. This will minimize the need to pause the discussion to take notes and ultimately keep the discussions as short as possible.

A4. Use of Existing Data: Efforts to reduce duplication, minimize burden, and increase utility and government efficiency

Every effort has been made to determine whether similar research and information exists by searching existing studies and reports, and in consultation with federal staff. As part of these efforts, the study team reviewed reports that specifically focus on fatherhood programs, as well as literature related to coparenting and HMRE. As noted above, the study team intends to analyze existing data where possible to reduce participant burden. Additional information beyond existing research and data is needed to better understand how fatherhood programs are supporting, and could better support, fathers' healthy romantic and coparenting relationships. The study team concluded that no existing data source can provide all data needed to fully address the study's objectives.

A5. Impact on Small Businesses

We do not anticipate any participating organizations will be small businesses. We will make every effort to minimize the burden on all organizations, including those that happen to be small businesses. The study team will accomplish this by reviewing as much information about the organizations as possible before contacting them so they do not spend time asking questions that are already known. The study team will interview staff and visit the programs only once and at times convenient to respondents.

A6. Consequences of Less Frequent Collection

This is a one-time data collection.

A7. Now subsumed under 2(b) above and 10 (below)

A8. Consultation

Alternative Supporting Statement for Information Collections Designed for Research, Public Health Surveillance, and Program Evaluation Purposes

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 September 20, 2019, Volume 84, Number 183, page 49524, and provided a sixty-day period for public comment. A copy of this notice is attached as **Appendix D**. During the notice and comment period, no substantive comments were received.

Consultation with Experts Outside the Study

The study team will regularly engage experts outside the study team throughout the duration of the study. Engaging HMRE/Coparenting/Fatherhood experts across varying fields will help ensure that they adequately identify unique challenges and considerations around supporting healthy romantic and coparenting relationships in fatherhood programs. The study team conducted a one-day in-person meeting with a group of experts, during which experts provided feedback on the study's objectives and research questions to help refine data collection priorities. A smaller group of the experts was consulted during the development of the data collection instruments to improve the quality and relevance of the questions and instructions, as well as assess participant burden. The study team also sought feedback from experts on the overall recruitment procedures, including whether engaging program directors in the recruitment of program participants is appropriate and feasible. To date the following experts have been engaged in the project:

- Jay Fagan
- Alan-Michael Graves
- Mary Myrick
- Kirk Berry
- Francesca Adler-Baeder
- Obie Clayton Jr.
- Ronald Cox Jr.
- Michael Duncan
- Amy Lewin
- Cynthia Osborne
- Mark Feinberg

Experts will also be engaged in future study activities including interpreting findings, reviewing written products, and disseminating the study's findings.

A9. Tokens of Appreciation

We propose to provide fathers and coparents participating in focus groups and interviews with a \$30 gift card as a token of appreciation. Although focus group and interview data are not intended to be representative in a statistical sense, it is important to secure participants with a range of background characteristics, to capture a variety of possible experiences with fatherhood program services. As all participants will be current or former fatherhood program participants, the target population is largely low-income. Without offsetting the direct costs incurred by respondents for attending the focus groups and interviews, such as arranging child care, transportation, or time off from paid work, the research team increases the risk that only those individuals able to overcome the financial barriers to attend will participate in the study. A \$30 gift card is appropriate to account for incidental expenses such as

Alternative Supporting Statement for Information Collections Designed for Research, Public Health Surveillance, and Program Evaluation Purposes

transportation and/or childcare that may otherwise prevent their participation in the study and is comparable to the amount provided in qualitative studies with similar populations, such as the Parents and Children Together Study (OMB control number 0970-0430).

A10. Privacy: Procedures to protect privacy of information, while maximizing data sharing

Personally Identifiable Information

All efforts will be made to reduce the personally identifiable information (PII) collected from all participants. For example, verbal consent will be obtained so that participants' names are not recorded on consent forms (a waiver of signed consent will be requested from the Child Trends IRB). The interviewer or focus group facilitator will document that verbal consent was obtained. Verbal consent will also be obtained prior to audio recording interviews and focus groups. Fathers and coparents will complete a demographic questionnaire, but their names will not be associated with their questionnaire responses. There is a risk that participants will volunteer PII during focus groups or interviews. All PII will be redacted from transcripts, and all data collected during the study (e.g., transcripts, recordings, questionnaires) will be stored securely (see **Data Security and Monitoring**) until they are destroyed.

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

Assurances of Privacy

Information collected will be kept private to the extent permitted by law. Respondents will be informed of all planned uses of data, that their participation is voluntary, and that their information will be kept private to the extent permitted by law. As specified in the contract, the Contractor will comply with all Federal and Departmental regulations for private information.

The study team intends to apply for a Certificate of Confidentiality (CoC) from the National Institutes of Health once IRB approval is granted from the Child Trends IRB (IRB approval is a requirement for submission of the CoC application). If a Certificate of Confidentiality is granted, the researchers may not disclose documents or information that may identify respondents in any federal, state, or local civil, criminal, administrative, legislative, or other action, suit, or proceeding, or that may be used as evidence (e.g., a court subpoena) unless respondents have consented for this use. Information or documents protected by this Certificate cannot be disclosed to anyone else who is not connected with the research except, if there is a federal, state, or local law that requires disclosure (such as to report child abuse). The Certificate of Confidentiality will not be used to prevent disclosure as required by federal, state, or local law of child abuse and neglect, or harm to self or others.

Data Security and Monitoring

The study team has developed a Data Security Plan that assesses all protections of respondents' PII. The Contractor shall ensure that all employees who perform work under this contract are trained on data privacy issues and comply with the study's Data Security Plan.

The Data Security Plan specifies that the study team will store data containing PII on secure servers and further encrypt with a password all documents that are used to link participant identities with their data. Every effort will be made to store data electronically only and shred any hard copies of data. Because participants will not be asked to sign consent forms, the study team does not anticipate having any

**Alternative Supporting Statement for Information Collections Designed for
Research, Public Health Surveillance, and Program Evaluation Purposes**

paper consent forms to store or destroy. When electronic conversion is not possible, non-electronic data (e.g., paper files) will be stored in locked cabinets. In instances where data need to be shared outside of Child Trends, for example the sharing of audio recordings with a transcription service, the study team shall use an electronic secure file transfer platform (SFTP) to protect all instances of sensitive information during storage and transmission. In all other instances, PII will be redacted before information is shared. During program visits and interviews, audio recordings will be saved on a portable audio recorder. Whenever possible, password-protected audio recorders will be used. If no password-protected recorders are available, staff are expected to move recordings from the device to a secure computer or the Child Trends' secure server as soon as internet access is available. Child Trends has organization-wide data security standards that includes a procedure to account for all laptop computers, desktop computers, and other mobile devices and portable media that store or process sensitive information.

A11. Sensitive Information³

ACF does not intend to collect any sensitive information in the course of this study. IRB approval will be obtained before any data are collected.

A12. Burden

Explanation of Burden Estimates

Table 2 includes the maximum number of sites each data collection activity will be conducted at, the proposed range of participants for each data collection activity at each site, and the maximum number of participants the study team is expecting for each data collection activity. The maximum number of participants expected were used to calculate the burden estimates for this study.

Table 2. Proposed Sample Sizes

| | Estimated maximum number of sites | Range per site | Estimated maximum number of participants |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------|--|
| Screening protocol | 20* | | |
| Program directors (screened, not selected for program visit) | 7 | 1-2 | 10 |
| Program directors (screened, selected for program visit) | 13 | 1-2 | 18 |
| Semi structured interviews | | | |
| Fatherhood program staff | 13 | 2-4 | 48 |
| Program partner staff | 13 | 0-2 | 14 |
| Nonparticipating fathers | 13 | 1-2 | 20 |

³ Examples of sensitive topics include (but not limited to): social security number; sex behavior and attitudes; illegal, anti-social, self-incriminating and demeaning behavior; critical appraisals of other individuals with whom respondents have close relationships, e.g., family, pupil-teacher, employee-supervisor; mental and psychological problems potentially embarrassing to respondents; religion and indicators of religion; community activities which indicate political affiliation and attitudes; legally recognized privileged and analogous relationships, such as those of lawyers, physicians and ministers; records describing how an individual exercises rights guaranteed by the First Amendment; receipt of economic assistance from the government (e.g., unemployment or WIC or SNAP); immigration/citizenship status.

**Alternative Supporting Statement for Information Collections Designed for
Research, Public Health Surveillance, and Program Evaluation Purposes**

| | | | |
|---|----------------|------|-----|
| Focus groups participants | | | |
| Fathers | 13 | 6-8 | 104 |
| Coparents | 6 [^] | 6-8 | 48 |
| Demographic survey respondents- fathers (participating and nonparticipating) | 13 | 7-10 | 124 |
| Demographic survey respondents- coparents | 6 | 6-8 | 48 |
| Curriculum developer interviews | n/a | n/a | 7 |

* The study team plans to screen up to 20 programs in order to select 13 programs that represent: both rural and urban settings; the South, Midwest, and both coasts; programs that serve participants from specific populations of interest (e.g., underemployed); services offered in-house and through a partner organization; and services offered to coparents (both with and without the requirement that fathers' be present). The study team estimates that multiple staff may participate in the screener at some sites, resulting in up to 10 program staff from 7 programs screened with no additional follow up. Up to 18 staff from a maximum of 13 programs will be screened and selected for inclusion in the study.

[^] It is likely that not all sites selected for program visits will offer services for coparents or have established relationships with coparents, therefore we are targeting holding focus group with coparents at approximately six of the thirteen sites.

Table 3 below shows estimated burden, including the number of respondents, frequency of response, annual hours of burden, and cost, of the information collection for screening and recruiting participants and for the semi-structured interviews and focus groups. Burden was estimated based on the length of the protocols and the proposed recruitment strategies.

Estimated Annualized Cost to Respondents

There is an estimated annualized cost to respondents of \$10,526. Fatherhood Program Directors' hourly wage estimate is \$34.46 based on BLS average earnings for Social and Community Service Managers.⁴ An hourly wage of \$21.62 was assumed for Program Facilitators based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics' (BLS) report on average earnings for Self-Enrichment Education Teachers, the job description that most closely describes the work of Program Facilitators.⁵ Thus, the average cost to respondents for the Fatherhood Program Staff Interviews is \$28.04. Program Partners' and Curriculum Developers' hourly wage is also estimated to be \$34.46 based on BLS earnings data. Fathers' and Coparents' hourly wage is estimated based on the federal minimum wage of \$7.25.⁶

Table 3. Burden Estimates

| Instrument | No. of Respondents (total over request period) | No. of Responses per Respondent (total over request period) | Avg. Burden per Response (in hours) | Total/ Annual Burden (in hours) | Average Hourly Wage Rate | Total Annual Respondent Cost |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Instrument 1: Screener for selecting fatherhood program visit sites – Screened, not selected for program | 10 | 1 | .5 | 5 | \$34.46 | \$172 |

⁴ Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). (2019). *Social and Community Service Managers, May 2018*. Retrieved from: <https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes119151.htm>

⁵ Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). (2019). *Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2018: 25-3021 Self-Enrichment Education Teachers*. Retrieved from: <https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes253021.htm>

⁶ Department of Labor (DOL). (2019). *Minimum Wage*. Retrieved from: <https://www.dol.gov/general/topic/wages/minimumwage>

**Alternative Supporting Statement for Information Collections Designed for
Research, Public Health Surveillance, and Program Evaluation Purposes**

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|-----|-----|---------|----------|
| visit | | | | | | |
| Instrument 1: Screener for selecting fatherhood program visit sites – Screened, selected for program visit (includes recruitment activities) | 18 | 1 | 6 | 108 | \$34.46 | \$3,722 |
| Instrument 2: Semi- structured interviews with fatherhood program staff | 48 | 1 | 2 | 96 | \$28.04 | \$2,692 |
| Instrument 3: Semi- structured interviews with program partner staff | 14 | 1 | 2 | 28 | \$34.46 | \$965 |
| Instrument 4: Semi- structured interviews with nonparticipating fathers | 20 | 1 | 1.5 | 30 | \$7.25 | \$218 |
| Instrument 5: Focus groups with fathers | 104 | 1 | 2 | 208 | \$7.25 | \$1,508 |
| Instrument 6: Focus groups with coparents | 48 | 1 | 2 | 96 | \$7.25 | \$696 |
| Instrument 7: Interviews with curriculum developers | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | \$34.46 | \$241 |
| Instrument 8: Demographic questionnaire – fathers | 124 | 1 | .25 | 31 | \$7.25 | \$225 |
| Instrument 9: Demographic questionnaire- coparents | 48 | 1 | .25 | 12 | \$7.25 | \$87 |
| Total | | | | 621 | | \$10,526 |

A13. Costs

There are no additional costs to respondents.

A14. Estimated Annualized Costs to the Federal Government

**Alternative Supporting Statement for Information Collections Designed for
Research, Public Health Surveillance, and Program Evaluation Purposes**

To determine the costs outlined in the table below, the study team estimated the staff labor hours, Other Direct Costs including travel and participant tokens of appreciation, and overhead costs associated with each activity.

Table 4. Estimated Costs

| Cost Category | Estimated Costs |
|---|------------------------|
| Instrument Development and OMB Clearance | \$74,500 |
| Field Work | \$246,000 |
| Analysis | \$70,200 |
| Publications/Dissemination | \$67,100 |
| Total costs over the one-year request period | \$457,800 |

A15. Reasons for changes in burden

This is a new information collection request.

A16. Timeline

Upon OMB approval, data will be collected over three months following approval. Data analysis will be completed within eight months. Reports, special topic papers, and other dissemination products will be produced following the data analyses and will conclude at the end of the contract.

Table 5. Anticipated Schedule (pending OMB approval)

| Timing | Activity |
|---|--|
| Immediately following OMB approval | Recruitment/Screening |
| Up to three months following OMB approval | Data collection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program visits • Interviews • Focus groups |
| 3-8 months following OMB approval | Data Analysis |
| 8-11 months following OMB approval | Reporting and Dissemination |

A17. Exceptions

No exceptions are necessary for this information collection.

Attachments

Appendices

- o Appendix A: Table of Objectives, Questions, and Respondents

**Alternative Supporting Statement for Information Collections Designed for
Research, Public Health Surveillance, and Program Evaluation Purposes**

- o Appendix B: CHaRMED Email and Phone Scripts
- o Appendix C: Program Observation Protocol
- o Appendix D: 60 Day Federal Register Notice
- o Appendix E: Screening Matrix CHaRMED Program Visits
- o Appendix F: Study Description
- o Appendix G: CHaRMED Consent Forms
- o Appendix H: Handout and Recruitment Flyer for Focus Group Participants
- o Appendix I: Consent Script for Focus Groups

Instruments

- o Instrument 1: CHaRMED Program Visit Screener
- o Instrument 2: Interview Protocol with Fatherhood Program Staff
- o Instrument 3: Interview Protocol with Program Partner Staff
- o Instrument 4: Interview Protocol with Nonparticipating Fathers
- o Instrument 5: Focus Group Protocol Fathers
- o Instrument 6: Focus Group Protocol Coparents
- o Instrument 7: Interview Protocol with Curriculum Developers
- o Instrument 8: Brief Questionnaire – Fathers
- o Instrument 9: Brief Questionnaire – Coparents_