

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

Fathers and Continuous Learning in Child Welfare Project

**OMB Generic Information Collection Request: Formative Data Collections
for Program Support**

0970-0531

Supporting Statement

Part A

Updated September 2020

Submitted By:

Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

4th Floor, Mary E. Switzer Building

330 C Street, SW

Washington, D.C. 20201

Project Officer:

Pooja Gupta

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

CONTENTS

A1. Necessity for Collection.....	2
A2. Purpose.....	2
Purpose and use.....	2
Research questions or tests.....	2
Study design.....	7
Site visit instruments.....	8
BSC implementation instruments.....	9
Other data sources and uses of information.....	11
A3. Use of information technology to reduce burden.....	12
A4. Use of existing data: efforts to reduce duplication, minimize burden, and increase utility and government efficiency.....	12
A5. Impact on small businesses.....	12
A6. Consequences of less frequent collection.....	12
A7. Now subsumed under 2(b) above and 10 (below).....	13
A8. Consultation.....	13
Federal Register notice and comments.....	13
Consultation with experts outside of the study.....	13
A9. Tokens of appreciation.....	14
A10. Privacy: procedures to protect privacy of information, while maximizing data sharing.....	14
Personally identifiable information.....	14
Assurances of privacy.....	15
Data security and monitoring.....	15
A11. Sensitive information.....	15
A12. Burden.....	15
Explanation of burden estimates.....	15
Estimated annualized cost to respondents.....	16
A13. Costs.....	17
A14. Estimated annualized costs to the federal government.....	17
A15. Reasons for changes in burden.....	18
A16. Timeline.....	18

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

A17. Exceptions..... 18
Attachments..... 19

**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 (ICR) is for a new Generic IC (GenIC) under the umbrella generic: Formative Data Collections for Program Support (OMB #0970-0531).
- **Description of request:** This GenIC is for a one-year pilot study to test the use of a continuous quality improvement methodology called the Breakthrough Series Collaborative (BSC) to strengthen the engagement of fathers and paternal relatives (FPRs) with children involved in the child welfare system. This is a descriptive process study. As many as six child welfare agencies will participate in the pilot study, which uses a mixed-methods approach to understand the feasibility of implementing the BSC within a child welfare agency and to identify strategies that may be evaluated in a later stage of the project. Information collection will include discussions with participating agency staff and key partners during site visits and instruments to collect information about the BSC implementation. We do not intend for the data we collect in the study to be generalized to a broader population. We do not intend for this information to be used as the principal basis for public policy decisions. ACF will use findings from the pilot study to inform later stages of the project, including a larger evaluation.

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

A1. Necessity for Collection

The Administration for Children and Families' (ACF) Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (OPRE) at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) seeks approval under the umbrella generic: Formative Data Collections for Program Support (OMB #0970-0531) to conduct a 12-month pilot study with as many as six child welfare agencies implementing the Breakthrough Series Collaborative (BSC) methodology to improve father and paternal relative (FPR) engagement in the child welfare system for the Fathers and Continuous Learning in Child Welfare (FCL) Project. The BSC methodology is a continuous quality improvement methodology that will be utilized to try to strengthen the engagement of FPRs with children involved in child welfare.

Research suggests that high quality father involvement is beneficial to children's well-being and development (Lamb 2004) and helps protect against child maltreatment (Bumpass and Lu 2000; Gaudin and Dubowitz 1997). Findings from federal Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSRs) (OMB# 0970-0214) reveal that child welfare agencies struggle to engage fathers and paternal relatives (JBS International 2016). The FCL project attempts to address the longstanding challenge of improving engagement of fathers and their relatives in the child welfare system and build the knowledge base for FPR engagement strategies.

There are no legal or administrative requirements that necessitate or authorize this information collection.

A2. Purpose

Purpose and use

The objectives of this pilot study are to understand the feasibility of implementing the BSC within a child welfare agency and to identify strategies that may be evaluated in a later stage of the project. The study will create a foundation for determining whether sites engaged in the BSC as planned and the feasibility of successfully implementing the BSC in child welfare settings to improve father and paternal relative engagement. This study will involve the delivery of targeted assistance and refinement related to program implementation as well as use rapid-cycle testing activities to strengthen programs in preparation for summative evaluation. ACF's overarching goals for the FCL project are to (1) document whether collaborating with system partners and continuously using data to improve engagement strategies can create a culture that "thinks about and engages fathers and paternal relatives" and, (2) contribute to the evidence base on father and paternal relative engagement strategies by evaluating potential promising strategies.

The information collected through this generic information collection (GenIC) will allow ACF to describe child welfare agencies' experiences implementing FPR engagement strategies using the BSC methodology. ACF will use the findings to inform future project activities, including an evaluation study. 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.

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

In June 2020, ACF extended the BSC from 12 months to 18 months to give participating sites more time to test strategies and begin to sustain efforts while receiving support and guidance from the FCL team. The extension allows for a previously unplanned third learning session to occur, albeit virtually given the current public health emergency. Like prior learning sessions, the FCL team has planned data collection activities to gather feedback on the learning session and to understand sites' assessments of their progress. While these data will not be included in the pilot study, which has completed data collection, [the learning session evaluations and site self-assessments are important feedback for improving work with participating sites while the BSC continues.](#)

Research questions or tests

This information collection will explore 11 broad research questions:

1. What father and paternal relative engagement strategies and implementation supports for the strategies existed at the start of the BSC?
2. What resources were required to implement the BSC?
3. What were the perceived benefits of the learning sessions to the Improvement Teams?
4. How did Improvement Teams prioritize the domains, objectives, and change concepts they would address during the pilot study?
5. What system partners were involved in implementing strategies based on the Collaborative Change Framework (CCF)?
6. What were barriers and facilitators to implementing the CCF?
7. What were barriers and facilitators to using the model for improvement?
8. What BSC elements (model of improvement, change framework, faculty, and shared learning environment) were most helpful to Improvement Teams? What BSC elements were most challenging?
9. Was there an improvement in site-specific aims and short-term outcomes?
10. Do sites plan to sustain practices identified in the CCF?
11. Has the BSC been implemented sufficiently to move engagement strategies to the evaluation stage?

Table 1 provides a crosswalk between the study instruments and the research questions each is designed to address. Following Table 1, we describe each of the instruments in detail.

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

Table 1. Research questions and data sources

	Site visit instruments				BSC instruments										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 & 10	9	11	12	13	14	15	16
Research questions	Improvement Team Group Interview	Focus Group with Engagement Strategy Staff	Interview with Child Welfare Agency Leaders	Group Interview of Fathers and Paternal Relatives on the Improvement Team	Improvement Team Information Form	Data Collection Planning Worksheet	Discussion Forum Prompts	Learning Session Day 1 Evaluation and Learning Session Overall Evaluation	Action Planning Form	Site Self-Assessment	Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) Worksheet	Implementation Assessment	Speed Sharing for Learning Session 2	Elevator Speech Assignment	Spreading and Sustaining the Work
1. What father and paternal relative engagement strategies and implementation supports for the strategies existed at the start of the BSC?		X		X	X					X					
2. What resources were required to implement the BSC?	X	X	X	X			X			X			X	X	X
3. What were the perceived benefits of the learning sessions to the Improvement Teams?	X		X					X		X	X				
4. How did Improvement Teams prioritize the domains, objectives, and change concepts they would address during the pilot study?	X	X	X	X		X			X						
5. What system partners were	X						X		X	X			X	X	X

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

	Site visit instruments				BSC instruments										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 & 10	9	11	12	13	14	15	16
Research questions	Improvement Team Group Interview	Focus Group with Engagement Strategy Staff	Interview with Child Welfare Agency Leaders	Group Interview of Fathers and Paternal Relatives on the Improvement Team	Improvement Team Information Form	Data Collection Planning Worksheet	Discussion Forum Prompts	Learning Session Day 1 Evaluation and Learning Session Overall Evaluation	Action Planning Form	Site Self-Assessment	Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) Worksheet	Implementation Assessment	Speed Sharing for Learning Session 2	Elevator Speech Assignment	Spreading and Sustaining the Work
involved in implementing strategies based on the CCF?															
6. What were barriers and facilitators to implementing the CCF?	X	X	X	X			X		X				X		
7. What were barriers and facilitators to using the model for improvement?	X	X	X	X			X		X				X		
8. What BSC elements (model of improvement, change framework, faculty, and shared learning environment) were most helpful to Improvement Teams? What BSC elements were most challenging?	X						X	X		X	X				
9. Was there an improvement in site-specific aims and short-term outcomes?		X		X		X	X	X				X	X	X	
10 Do sites plan to	X							X	X	X			X		X

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

	Site visit instruments				BSC instruments										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 & 10	9	11	12	13	14	15	16
				Group Interview of Fathers and Paternal Relatives on the Improvement Team				Learning Session Day 1 Evaluation and Learning Session Overall Evaluation							
Research questions	Improvement Team Group Interview	Focus Group with Engagement Strategy Staff	Interview with Child Welfare Agency Leaders		Improvement Team Information Form	Data Collection Planning Worksheet	Discussion Forum Prompts		Action Planning Form	Site Self-Assessment	Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) Worksheet	Implementation Assessment	Speed Sharing for Learning Session 2	Elevator Speech Assignment	Spreading and Sustaining the Work
sustain practices identified in the CCF?															
11. Has the BSC been implemented sufficiently to move engagement strategies to the evaluation stage?	X	X	X					X		X	X				

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

Study design

The proposed pilot study is a descriptive process study. To comprehensively understand and assess each improvement team's experience with the BSC methodology and their experience planning, testing, and adjusting FPR engagement strategies, both qualitative and quantitative data sources are necessary.

The FCL project team worked with federal partners, experts, and stakeholders familiar with child welfare agencies to identify 10 promising candidate sites for inclusion in the proposed pilot study (OMB Control No. 0970-0356; approved March 26, 2018). The FCL project team worked with federal partners and selected six sites for the pilot study from the 10 candidate sites based on the following criteria: (1) interest in and an identified champion of change for the BSC (based on phone and site visits), (2) range and depth of FPR engagement strategies of interest to the site, (3) capacity and willingness to collaborate with system partners, and (4) organizational capacity for BSC.

The FCL project team will assist participating sites with identifying up to 10 child welfare agency staff (such as managers, supervisors, and workers) and community partner staff (such as staff from father engagement organizations) to participate in multi-level Improvement Teams. Improvement Team members will participate in the following activities related to BSC implementation:

1. Two in-person learning sessions and one virtual learning session with content experts and quality improvement specialists during the year.
2. Online collaboration through a protected SharePoint site.
3. Utilize a Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) improvement cycle approach between each learning session to test small changes in practice as they strive to implement, spread, and sustain the improvement across their agency.

To develop the aims that will drive the Improvement Teams' efforts, the FCL project team engaged a group of experts to provide input on the development of a Collaborative Change Framework (CCF). This framework provides five domains that will drive sites' (1) assessments of their strengths and challenges regarding FPR engagement, (2) decisions about domains to prioritize and strategies to test, and (3) assessments of progress over time. These five domains are:

- Support community, system, and agency environments that value and respect all fathers and paternal relatives
- Cultivate racial equity for men of color in the child welfare system
- Identify and locate fathers and paternal relatives from the first point of contact with the family
- Assess and address the strengths and needs of, and barriers for, fathers and paternal relatives
- Continuously involve fathers and paternal relatives throughout the lives of their children

To complete small tests of change, it is essential for Improvement Teams to track and report on specific measures to monitor progress and improvements at multiple points throughout the pilot study. The FCL project team conducted 1.5-day site visits to four study sites and due to the COVID-19 pandemic, will conduct two virtual site visits to two study sites to engage key stakeholders (see Table 3 for details on

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

stakeholder respondents) in interviews and focus groups about their experiences with the BSC methodology and the FPR engagement strategies.

One notable limitation of the study design is the generalizability of the study findings. The six sites in the pilot study will not be representative of all child welfare agencies across the United States. Rather, the sites are a convenience sample of child welfare agencies selected for their potential to participate in a BSC. As a result, information we collect with this study design about the process of BSC implementation may not be generalized to the broader population of child welfare agencies. However, observing BSC implementation with high-capacity sites will directly inform ACF’s assessment of the potential of the BSC methodology in child welfare to create a culture that “thinks about and engages fathers and paternal relatives.”

To address the research questions, we collected data using four site visit instruments in four in person site visits. For virtual site visits, we will collect data using four updated site visit instruments that reflect virtual data collection. We will also continue to collect data using 12 BSC implementation instruments. See Table 2 for an overview of the proposed instruments.

Table 2. Information Collections

Data Collection Activity/Instrument	Respondent(s)	Content and Reason for Collection	Mode and Duration
Site Visits			
Instrument 1: Semi-Structured Protocol: Improvement Team Group Interview	Improvement Team members, which include child welfare agency staff (such as managers, supervisors, and workers) and community partner staff (such as staff from father engagement organizations). Respondents will not include fathers and paternal relatives who are members of the Improvement Team.	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience with the BSC • Resources required to participate in the BSC • Perceived benefits of the learning sessions • Barriers and facilitators to implementing strategies based on the CCF and using the model for improvement • Progress toward site-specific aims and short-term outcomes • Plans for sustaining the practices identified based on the CCF • Consistency with the five key elements of a BSC <p>Reason: To collect information on their experiences with the BSC</p>	<p>Mode: In person interview for the four completed site visits and virtual interviews for two site visits</p> <p>Duration: 1.5 hours</p>
Instrument 2: Semi-Structured Protocol: Focus Group with Engagement Strategy Staff	Child welfare agency staff involved in the FPR engagement strategies who are not Improvement	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perspectives on the implementation, feasibility, and success of the BSC and strategies • Assessment of the level of FPR engagement gained as a result of 	<p>Mode: In person interview for the four completed site visits and virtual interviews for two site visits</p>

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

Data Collection Activity/Instrument	Respondent(s)	Content and Reason for Collection	Mode and Duration
	Team members	<p>implementing various strategies</p> <p>Reason: To understand other child welfare agency staff perspectives on the implementation, feasibility, and success of the BSC and strategies</p>	<p>Duration: 1.5 hours</p>
Instrument 3: Semi-Structured Protocol: Interview with Child Welfare Agency Leaders	Child welfare agency leaders	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the agency prioritized domains, goals, and change concepts • Resources required to participate in the BSC • Factors that may have influenced strategies tested and implemented as part of the BSC <p>Reason: To understand the child welfare agency leader perspective and experience participating in the BSC.</p>	<p>Mode: In person interview for the four completed site visits and virtual interviews for two site visits</p> <p>Duration: 1 hour</p>
Instrument 4: Semi-Structured Protocol: Group Interview of Fathers and Paternal Relatives on the Improvement Team	Improvement Team members who are fathers or paternal relatives.	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perspective of the BSC and the engagement strategies • Experience in the child welfare system <p>Reason: To understand fathers and paternal relatives' perspectives on the BSC and the engagement strategies and experience with the child welfare system.</p>	<p>Mode: In person interview for the four completed site visits and virtual interviews for two site visits</p> <p>Duration: 1 hour</p>
BSC Implementation			
Instrument 5: Improvement Team Information Form	Improvement Team senior leader	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child welfare agency characteristics • Improvement team composition • Child welfare agency background <p>Reason: To create a profile of each site that participates in the BSC</p>	<p>Mode: Electronic submission to a secure website</p> <p>Duration: 1 hour</p>
Instrument 6: Data Collection Planning Worksheet	Improvement Team members	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How and when data will be collected • Who will collect the data • Tools, training, resources, and supports needed for data collection <p>Reason: Prepare Improvement Teams to collect and track data on key metrics as part of the BSC.</p>	<p>Mode: Electronic submission to a secure website</p> <p>Duration: 2 hours</p>
Instrument 7: Discussion Forum Prompts	Improvement Team members	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current challenges and successes in implementing strategies 	<p>Mode: Electronic submission to a secure website</p>

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

Data Collection Activity/Instrument	Respondent(s)	Content and Reason for Collection	Mode and Duration
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helpful resources for implementing strategies <p>Reason: To help Improvement Teams share information with one another and solve problems with improvement practices and organizational capacity for improvement.</p>	<p>Duration: 0.25 hours</p>
Instrument 8: Learning Session Day 1 Evaluation	Improvement Team members attending in-person and virtual learning session	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most and least helpful aspects of the learning session • General feedback or suggestions for the BSC <p>Reason: To gather feedback on the Improvement Team members' experiences with the first day of each 2-day learning session.</p>	<p>Mode: Pencil and paper</p> <p>Duration: 0.16 hours</p>
Instrument 9: Action Planning Form	Improvement Team members	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change to test in the current PDSA cycle • How to measure the success of the change • Who will be responsible for the change • When the PDSA cycle will be complete <p>Reason: To help Improvement Teams document their focus of improvement for each action period.</p>	<p>Mode: Electronic submission to a secure website</p> <p>Duration: 0.25 hours</p>
Instrument 10: Learning Session Overall Evaluation	Improvement Team members	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall feedback on the learning session • What from the learning session could use improvement and what was best about the learning session • Feedback on the learning session affinity group sessions, flow and structure, balanced focus, and storyboards. <p>Reason: To gather feedback on the Improvement Team members' overall experiences with each learning session.</p>	<p>Mode: Pencil and paper; electronic submission to a secure website</p> <p>Duration: 0.25 hours</p>
Instrument 11: Site Self-Assessment	Improvement Team members	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of agency's functioning (on a Likert scale of 1 to 4) across each domain's goals <p>Reason: To understand the extent to which Improvement Team members have engaged in BSC activities and how much others</p>	<p>Mode: Electronic submission to a secure website</p> <p>Duration: 1.7 hours</p>

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

Data Collection Activity/Instrument	Respondent(s)	Content and Reason for Collection	Mode and Duration
		outside of the Improvement Team may have participated in BSC activities.	
Instrument 12: Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) Worksheet	Improvement Team members	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans to test a change • How the change was tested • What was learned from the change • Plans for next steps <p>Reason: To allow Improvement Teams to track progress with tests of change conducted as part of the BSC.</p>	<p>Mode: Electronic submission to a secure website</p> <p>Duration: 0.25 hours</p>
Instrument 13: Implementation Assessment	Improvement Team members	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to engage in positive ways with FPRs • Ability to create an environment that values and respects FPRs • Ability to identify, locate, and engage FPRs and address any barriers to engagement <p>Reason: to understand the extent to which Improvement Team members and other staff have engaged in BSC activities as individuals</p>	<p>Mode: Electronic submission to a secure website</p> <p>Duration: 0.33 hours</p>
Instrument 14: Speed Sharing for Learning Session 2	Improvement Team members	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practices and successes Improvement Teams have found <p>Reason: Help Improvement Team members share successes and practices with each other in a succinct and creative manner.</p>	<p>Mode: Electronic submission</p> <p>Duration: .16 hours</p>
Instrument 15: Elevator Speech Assignment	Improvement Team members attending an in-person learning session	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem Improvement Team is trying to solve • Solutions, needs, and next steps for priorities and goals of the Improvement Team <p>Reason: Help Improvement Team members think about how they will discuss the work they are doing with other stakeholders.</p>	<p>Mode: Pencil and paper; electronic submission to a secure website</p> <p>Duration: .5 hours</p>
Instrument 16: Spreading and Sustaining the Work	Improvement Team members	<p>Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the agency will spread and sustain capacity for engaging FPRs across a range of elements such as leadership, capacity, and staffing. <p>Reason: Guide Improvement Team members</p>	<p>Mode: Pencil and paper; electronic submission to a secure website</p> <p>Duration: 1 hour</p>

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

Data Collection Activity/Instrument	Respondent(s)	Content and Reason for Collection	Mode and Duration
		in spreading and sustaining their improvement work related to engaging FPRs.	

Other data sources and uses of information

This ICR is part of a collection of ICRs for each phase of the FCL project. The first ICR was a formative GenIC (0970-0356), which informed ACF’s identification of promising candidate sites for the pilot study, was approved in March 2018. The current GenIC is for the pilot study. We will submit a full ICR for a later evaluation study based upon findings from these GenICs.

A3. Use of information technology to reduce burden

The BSC implementation instruments will be Microsoft Word or Excel files submitted through SharePoint or forms directly on SharePoint, a secure file transfer site that can be accessed only by BSC participants using their unique usernames and passwords. We anticipate that these formats will provide the lowest burden on the respondent.

The information to be collected during site visits is not conducive to the use of information technology, such as computerized interviewing. In-person site visits offer the best opportunity to tailor interviews to the specific child welfare agency (or partner) with minimal burden on the agency (or partner). Due to COVID-19 pandemic, virtual site visits offer the next best opportunity to engage with agency staff and partners while tailoring interviews to the specific agency with minimal burden. For all site visit discussions, audio recorders will be used with permission from participants to inform discussion summaries.

A4. Use of existing data: efforts to reduce duplication, minimize burden, and increase utility and government efficiency

Data collected for this study cannot be found anywhere else. To our knowledge, this is the first study using the BSC methodology to increase FPR engagement in child welfare.

A5. Impact on small businesses

The study will include state and local child welfare agencies—the selected sites for the pilot—and partner organizations. The FCL project team will minimize burden for respondents by restricting the interview length to the minimum required and conducting site visits and interviews at times convenient for the respondents. The FCL project team will request only information required for the intended use.

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

A6. Consequences of less frequent collection

Without collecting information from multiple stakeholders involved in the FCL project at multiple points in time, ACF risks missing information on the feasibility of implementing FPR engagement strategies using the BSC methodology.

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

A8. Consultation

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 two notices in the Federal Register announcing the agency's intention to request an OMB review of this information collection activity. The first notice was published on October 11, 2017, Volume 82, Number 195, page 47212, and provided a sixty-day period for public comment. ACF did not receive any substantive comments on the first notice. The second notice was published in the Federal Register on June 18, 2019 and comments were directed to OMB.

Consultation with experts outside of the study

We consulted with a panel of experts in child welfare services, fatherhood services, research, and staff from ACF program offices on the pilot study (Table 3).

The BSC process involves the inclusion of content experts and quality improvement specialists who will engage with and provide support to the sites. The FCL project team selected six experts for the pilot study in August 2019.

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

Table 3. Outside experts consulting on study

Name	Affiliation
Angela Parks-Pyles	LA County Department of Children and Family Services
Armon Perry	Kent School of Social Work, University of Louisville
Ed Davies	Power of Fathers, Children's Home and Aid
Elizabeth Thompson	Kennedy Krieger Institute
Jason Mahoney	Wake County Department of Human Services
Josephine (Jo) Rutledge	Wake County Department of Human Services
Justin Harty	The University of Chicago
Kate Eller	Cook County Public Guardian, Child Protection Division
Ken Sanders	Center on Fathering
Matt Brega	Contra Costa Department of Child Support Services
Maureen Tabor	Family Connections/Grandparent Family Connections
Michael Huesca	Paternal Opportunities, Programs, and Services (POPS)
Reginald Carter	LA County Department of Children and Family Services
Ryan Bennett	LA County Department of Children and Family Services
Sacha Coupet	Loyola University
Stacey Shipe	Binghamton University
Tony Craddock	Wake County Department of Human Services
Tyreasa Washington	University of North Carolina at Greensboro School of Social Work
Yadira Ijeh	CT Department of Children and Families

A9. Tokens of appreciation

FCL does not include tokens of appreciation for study participation.

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

Personally identifiable information

This effort does not include the collection of sensitive personally identifiable information (PII). This collection of PII for this effort is limited to collecting names, email addresses, and telephone numbers for the purpose of contacting them during BSC activities and information collection (for example, site visits) in which they may participate. Information will not be maintained in a paper or electronic system from which data are actually or directly retrieved by an individuals' personal identifier. Personally identifiable information will not be kept in the same location as any data collected. Access to their contact information is restricted to only those working on the FCL project.

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

Assurances of privacy

We will inform respondents 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 the contract specifies, the contractor will comply with all federal and departmental regulations for private information. The contractor shall ensure that all of its employees, subcontractors (at all tiers), and employees of each subcontractor, who perform work under this contract/subcontract, are trained on data privacy issues and comply with the above requirements.

Data security and monitoring

The FCL project, as specified in the contract, has an established Data Security and Monitoring plan that assesses all data security measures and monitoring procedures to ensure secure storage and transmittal of information. This plan will be updated at least annually.

We will collect minor, non-sensitive PII from the sites that include their names and email addresses. This information will be stored on a secure SharePoint site. Any data from semi-structured interviews and focus groups will be collected and stored securely on the SharePoint site.

Mathematica's external SharePoint 2013 environment is hosted on Project Hosts, a Federal private cloud service provider, FedRamp certified at IaaS level. The environment has a FedRAMP Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS)-level Provisional Authority to Operate (P-ATO). Mathematica and Project Hosts share responsibilities for protecting and securing all SharePoint sites hosted by Mathematica. Unique accounts are required to access the SharePoint sites. Data are encrypted both in transit using Transport Layer Security and at rest with FIPS 140-2 compliant mechanisms.

A11. Sensitive information

There are no sensitive questions in this data collection. The project team will seek IRB approval after OMB approval has been granted.

A12. Burden

Table 4 presents the burden requests for the new information collection. The burden estimates are derived from the FCL project team's experience, such as the following:

- Qualitative data collection with child welfare agency staff for the project's previously approved GenIC (OMB Control No. 0970-0356) and with social service providers for other ACF studies such as the Parents and Children Together Evaluation (0970-0403).
- Data collection using similar instruments on the Culture of Continuous Learning Project: A Breakthrough Series Collaborative for Improving Child Care and Head Start Quality (CCL) (0970-0507).

The total estimated burden is 1,103 hours.

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

Estimated annualized cost to respondents

The estimated annual cost is \$28,994. To compute the total estimated annual cost for Instruments 1 through 3 and 5 through 16, we used the average hourly wage for agency directors and social workers. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Occupational Employment Statistics (2018), the mean hourly wage, nationally, for agency directors is \$34.17 and \$23.79 for social workers. For Instrument 4, we estimated the average hourly wage based on the current federal minimum wage, \$7.25.

Table 4. Burden hours requested under this information collection

Instrument	No. of Respondents (total over request period)	No. of Responses per Respondent (total over request period)	Avg. Burden per Response (in hours)	Total Burden (in hours)	Average Hourly Wage Rate	Total Annual Respondent Cost
Site Visit Instruments						
Instrument 1: Semi-Structured Protocol: Improvement Team Group Interview	48	1	1.5	72	\$23.79	\$1,713
Instrument 2: Semi-Structured Protocol: Focus Group with Engagement Strategy Staff	60	1	1.5	90	\$23.79	\$2,141
Instrument 3: Semi-Structured Protocol: Interview with Child Welfare Agency Leaders	6	1	1	6	\$34.17	\$205
Instrument 4: Semi-Structured Protocol: Group Interview of Fathers and Paternal Relatives on the Improvement Team	12	1	1	12	\$7.25	\$87
BSC Implementation Instruments						
Instrument 5: Improvement Team Information Form	6	1	1	6	\$23.79	\$143
Instrument 6: Data Collection Planning Worksheet	60	1	2	120	\$23.79	\$2,855
Instrument 7: Discussion Forum Prompts	60	4	0.25	60	\$23.79	\$1,427

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

Instrument 8: Learning Session Day 1 Evaluation	36	3	0.16	18	\$23.79	\$411
Instrument 9: Action Planning Form	60	3	0.25	45	\$23.79	\$1,071
Instrument 10: Learning Session Overall Evaluation	60	4	0.25	60	\$23.79	\$1,427
Instrument 11: Site Self-Assessment	60	3	1.7	306	\$23.79	\$7,280
Instrument 12: Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) Worksheet	60	15	0.25	225	\$23.79	\$5,353
Instrument 13: Implementation Assessment	60	2	0.33	40	\$23.79	\$942
Instrument 14: Speed Sharing for Learning Session 2	60	1	0.16	10	\$23.79	\$228
Instrument 15: Elevator Speech Assignment	36	2	0.5	36	\$23.79	\$856
Instrument 16: Spreading and Sustaining the Work	60	2	1	120	\$23.79	\$2,855
Total estimated annual burden				1,225		\$28,994

A13. Costs

There are no additional costs to respondents.

A14. Estimated annualized costs to the federal government

The total cost for the data collection activities under this current request will be \$1,085,994. This amount includes all costs related to study design and development, information collection, and analyses of data (Table 5).

Table 5. Cost of proposed data collection

Cost category	Estimated costs
Recruit and engage faculty	\$245,844

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

Develop pilot study plan and instrument design	\$109,805
Submit OMB, IRB, and Certificate of Confidentiality	\$99,924
Conduct BSC, pilot study, and data collection	\$619,826
Privacy and data security	\$10,595
Total costs over the request period	\$1,085,994

A15. Reasons for changes in burden

This data collection is a new GenIC under the umbrella generic: Formative Data Collections for Program Support (OMB #0970-0531).

A16. Timeline

Data collection will take place following OMB approval for 12 months. Preliminary analysis of data will begin 1 month after data collection begins. The FCL project team expects to complete a pilot study report 1 month after completion of pilot study data collection. The report is intended for internal ACF use, but may be shared with the participating sites.

Data we are collecting do not lend themselves to secondary analysis and no datasets will be shared publicly. Table 6 presents the timeline for data collection, analysis, and reporting for the pilot study¹.

Table 6. Data collection schedule for FCL Pilot Study

Data collection activities	2019	2020		
	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3
Data collection	✓	✓	✓	✓
Analysis	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reporting				✓

A17. Exceptions

No exceptions are necessary for this information collection.

Attachments

Instrument 1: Semi-Structured Protocol: Improvement Team Group Interview

¹ Pilot study data collection is complete and the schedule is not affected by the addition of a third learning session.

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

Instrument 2: Semi-Structured Protocol: Focus Group with Engagement Strategy Staff

Instrument 3: Semi-Structured Protocol: Interview with Child Welfare Agency Leaders

Instrument 4: Semi-Structured Protocol: Group Interview of Fathers and Paternal Relatives on the Improvement Team

Instrument 5: Improvement Team Information Form

Instrument 6: Data Collection Planning Worksheet

Instrument 7: Discussion Forum Prompts

Instrument 8: Learning Session Day 1 Evaluation

Instrument 9: Action Planning Form

Instrument 10: Learning Session Overall Evaluation

Instrument 11: Site Self-Assessment

Instrument 12: Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) Worksheet

Instrument 13: Implementation Assessment

Instrument 14: Speed Sharing for Learning Session 2

Instrument 15: Elevator Speech Assignment

Instrument 16: Spreading and Sustaining the Work

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

References

Bumpass, L., and H.-H. Lu. "Trends in Cohabitation and Implications for Children's Family Contexts in the United States." *Population Studies*, vol. 54, no. 1, 2000, pp. 29-41.

Gaudin, J.M., and H. Dubowitz. "Family Functioning in Neglectful Families: Recent Research." In *Child Welfare Research Review*, edited by J.D. Berrick, R.P. Barth, and N. Gilbert. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997, pp. 28-62.

JBS International. "Child and Family Services Aggregate Report." Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children's Bureau, 2016.

Lamb, Michael E. (ed.). *The Role of the Father in Child Development*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley, 2004.