The John H. Chafee Foster Care Program for Successful Transition to Adulthood Strengthening Outcomes for Transition to Adulthood (Chafee SOTA) Project

Formative Data Collections for ACF Research

0970 – 0356

Supporting Statement

Part A

AUGUST 2022

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 Officers:
Kelly Jedd McKenzie
Harmanpreet Bhatti

Part A

Executive Summary

- **Type of Request:** This Information Collection Request is for a generic information collection under the umbrella generic, Formative Data Collections for ACF Research (0970-0356).

- **Description of Request:**
  The purpose of this request is to collect information to identify 5-6 promising programs that demonstrate readiness to participate in future evaluations involving innovative learning methods that will build evidence about what works to promote positive outcomes for youth transitioning from foster care into adulthood and young adults formerly in care who transitioned in the recent past (ages 14-26).

  There are <u>three primary information collection activities</u> for the program identification and engagement process (and the purposes of this request): (1) a call for nominations (third-party and self-nominations) whereby information is gathered about programs via a standard form to identify up to 36 candidate programs that meet the initial criteria for inclusion; (2) follow-up telephone interviews with program leadership to identify 9 programs to participate in onsite evaluability assessments (EAs), and (3) onsite evaluability assessments (EAs), to include program observations, focus groups, and interviews with program staff and participants to determine the final 5-6 programs that could participate in the future evaluations.

  All information gathered through these three primary data collection activities will be used to identify 5-6 programs that have the capacity to participate in the future evaluations. Data collected in this study are not intended 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.

- **Time Sensitivity:**
  These activities will directly inform an evaluation for which we will submit a full information collection request. This evaluation has a tight timeline, so we request review of these initial activities as soon as possible.

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

A1. Necessity for Collection

The John H. Chafee Foster Care Program for Successful Transition to Adulthood (Chafee program) funds state and tribal programs that help youth transitioning out of foster care[1] achieve self-sufficiency. When the Chafee program was created following the passage of the Foster Care Independence Act (FCIA) of 1999 (Public Law 106-169), the legislation required that a small percentage of funding be set aside for rigorous evaluations of independent living programs that are "innovative or of potential national significance."

This clearance is necessary to allow the Chafee Strengthening Outcomes for Transition to Adulthood (Chafee SOTA) project team to systematically collect a standard set of information from programs serving youth transitioning from foster care to adulthood. The information will allow the team to identify 5-6 programs with the capacity to participate in future program evaluations using innovative learning methods. The goal of these evaluations is to build the evidence about what works to improve outcomes for the target population.

A2. Purpose

Purpose and Use

Prior evaluation work conducted by ACF on the Chafee program found that, for many independent living programs, traditional, large-scale impact evaluations were not feasible due to such issues as program size, lack of appropriate comparison groups, or implementation challenges.

To address these challenges, the larger Chafee SOTA project intends to:

- Develop and implement innovative methods for identifying and evaluating promising practices and programs serving youth transitioning out of foster care;
- Improve the feasibility and rigor of evaluations that test the effectiveness of program services or components; and
- Quickly add information to the field about how best to serve youth transitioning from foster care in the absence of multiple large-scale evaluations.

The purpose of the three data collection activities proposed in this request is to identify a minimum of 36 candidate programs for the evaluation and then systematically screen these programs to determine program readiness to participate in future evaluation activities. Evaluability assessments will be conducted with nine selected programs to ensure that a final 5-6 selected programs meet the study criteria and are ready to support a formal evaluation of their services using one of several innovative learning methods. Determining readiness is fundamental to the success of the evaluations.

---

[1] Chafee programs generally serve both youth (14 – 17 years of age) and young adults (18 – 26 years of age). For the purposes of this submission, unless otherwise stated, we will use the term "youth" to refer to the full population of individuals served under Chafee (those 14 – 26 years of age).

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

This proposed information collection meets the following goals of ACF's generic clearance for formative data collections for research and evaluation (0970-0356):

- inform the development of ACF research
- maintain a research agenda that is rigorous and relevant
- ensure that research products are as current as possible

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.

Guiding Questions

The three data collection activities described in this package are guided by overarching questions which, answered in the affirmative, are likely to determine readiness and thereby increase the probability of successful participation in the main evaluation:

<u>Data collection activity #1 (call for nominations)</u>

- Does the program target youth transitioning from foster care into adulthood and/or young adults formerly in care who transitioned in the recent past (ages 14-26)?
- Is the program sufficiently established (i.e., in operation long enough to have a fully developed and implemented intervention)?
- Does the program have sufficient participation to meet potential evaluation requirements?
- Has the program been evaluated previously, and, if so, will learnings from prior evaluation inform a potential evaluation design?

<u>Data collection activity #2 (interviews)</u>

- Do the program's priorities and goals meet the necessary inclusion criteria?
- Are the program staff willing and able to engage in innovative learning methods?
- Do the program's existing data infrastructures and capabilities support an evaluation (i.e., a willingness and ability to collect and share data)?
- Does the program collect and maintain contact information for its clients?
- Does the program focus on ways youth can be engaged in program planning, implementation and participation?
- Does the program document youth involvement?

<u>Data collection activity #3 (evaluability assessments)</u>

- Is the intervention being implemented routinely (that is, being used regularly, in every applicable instance)?
- Is there a documented framework (i.e., logic model, theory of change) identifying the connection between services and outcomes, and is it credible?
- Does the program have the resources to conduct an evaluation (staff, capacity, interest)?
- Is there evidence that the intervention is being implemented with fidelity?

  - Does the program have high quality program monitoring (i.e., fidelity) data (i.e., to assess that the intervention is being used as intended) that can be used for an evaluation?
- Does the program have high quality baseline data that can be used for an evaluation?
- Does the program have high quality outcome data that can be used for an evaluation?
- Is the program's baseline, program monitoring, and/or outcome data available and accessible for evaluation purposes?

Study Design

Our model for identifying programs to participate in this study will be the Systematic Screening and Assessment (SSA) Method. SSA combines components of traditional screening and assessment methodology with planned input and feedback from stakeholders with direct experience and perspective to inform the process (e.g., federal staff, individuals with lived experience, including youth and young adults). The SSA Method is an approach aimed at identifying practice-based interventions that are ready for evaluation. In a sequential process, the SSA Method involves a call for nominations of promising practices, follow-up telephone interviews with program leadership, and evaluability assessments (EAs) (Leviton and Gutman, 2010), all designed to achieve the goal of identifying promising interventions with a degree of readiness for evaluation.

For the purposes of this submission, we will implement four steps associated with the SSA Method. These are: (1) solicit nominations (activity 1); (2) conduct interviews with directors of 36 nominated programs (activity 2); (3) conduct EAs with nine programs (activity 3); and (4) make recommendations for 5-6 programs to participate in the larger study. Activities 1, 2, and 3 include primary data collection and are the focus of this OMB submission. For activity 3, we will work with the executive directors of selected sites to identify and engage staff, and with directors and program staff to identify and engage youth participants for the focus groups. Because we anticipate significant differences in services and service delivery across providers, this will likely vary by site.

Exhibit A2-1. Study Design

Data Collection Activity 1	***Instrument***	***Respondents, Content, Purpose of Collection***	***Mode and Duration***
Program nominations	Instrument 1: Call for Nominations	**Respondents**: Programs interested in participating **Content**: Contact information for nominated programs and foundational questions. **Purpose**: To identify at least 36 promising programs and services for target population.	**Mode**: Web and email. **Duration**: 15 minutes.
Data Collection Activity 2	***Instrument***	***Respondents, Content, Purpose of Collection***	***Mode and Duration***
Telephone followup	Instrument 2:	**Respondents**: Executive directors	**Mode**: Telephone (or

(interviews) with executive directors	Followup Questions for Executive Directors	identified during activity 1. **Content**: Questions are structured around the following three areas: (1) interest in participating; (2) program components; (3) evaluation potential and capacity. **Purpose**: To gather data permitting assessment of programs to identify at least nine programs for evaluability assessments.	virtual platform such as Zoom or Teams). **Duration**: 1 hour.
Data Collection Activity 3	***Instruments***	***Respondents, Content, Purpose of Collection***	***Mode and Duration***
Onsite (or virtual) interviews with executive directors	Instrument 3: EA Interview Guide for Executive Directors	**Respondents**: Executive directors. **Content:** Questions are structured around the following six areas: (1) program overview, background, and context; (2) services provided; (3) program outcomes; (4) evaluation potential and capacity; (5) key challenges to service delivery and fidelity; and (6) commitment to youth engagement in program planning and implementation. **Purpose**: To assess programs to identify at least six programs for participation in the larger study.	**Mode**: In-person, onsite (or virtual platform such as Zoom or Teams). **Duration**: up to 90 minutes.
Onsite (or virtual) interviews with partner agency directors	Instrument 4: EA Interview Guide for Partner Agency Directors	**Respondents**: Partner agency directors. **Content**: Questions are structured around the following six areas: (1) program overview, background, and context; (2) services provided; (3) program outcomes; (4) evaluation potential and capacity; (5) key challenges to service delivery and fidelity; and (6) commitment to youth engagement in program planning and implementation. **Purpose**: To assess programs to	**Mode**: In-person, onsite (or virtual platform such as Zoom or Teams). **Duration**: up to 90 minutes.

		identify at least six programs for participation in the larger study.	
Onsite (or virtual) focus groups with program staff	Instrument 5: EA Focus Group Guide for Program Staff	**Respondents**: Program staff. **Content**: Questions are structured around the following six areas: (1) program overview, background, and context; (2) services provided; (3) program outcomes; (4) evaluation potential and capacity; (5) key challenges to service delivery and fidelity; and (6) commitment to youth engagement in program planning and implementation. **Purpose**: To identify at least six promising programs and services for evaluation.	**Mode**: In-person, onsite (or virtual platform such as Zoom or Teams). **Duration**: up to 90 minutes.
Onsite (or virtual) focus groups with program partner staff (if applicable)	Instrument 6: EA Focus Group Guide for Partner Agency Staff	**Respondents**: Partner agency staff. **Content**: Questions are structured around the following six areas: (1) program overview, background, and context; (2) services provided; (3) program outcomes; (4) evaluation potential and capacity; (5) key challenges to service delivery and fidelity; and (6) commitment to youth engagement in program planning and implementation. **Purpose**: To identify at least six promising programs and services for evaluation.	**Mode**: In-person, onsite (or virtual platform such as Zoom or Teams). **Duration**: up to 90 minutes.
Onsite (or virtual) focus groups with program participants (18 years of age or older)[2]	Instrument 7: EA Focus Group Guide for Youth Participants	**Respondents**: Youth participants. **Content**: Questions are geared around youth engagement in the program and evaluation, and structured around the following four areas: (1) services received; (2) perceptions of services; (3) service outcomes; and (4) key barriers to service access, delivery and	**Mode**: In-person, onsite (or virtual platform such as Zoom or Teams). **Duration**: up to 90 minutes.

[2] We will explore the possibility of including youth under 18 with the nine selected EA sites; however, given our experience conducting research with this population (i.e., youth in or transitioning from foster care) and the ambitious timeline we have for completing EAs, it will likely be challenging and time-consuming to obtain parental consent for youth under 18 to participate in data collection activities. Furthermore, Westat's IRB scrutinizes such requests closely; as such, requests to include youth under 18 may be prohibitive both in terms of time and resources.

		effectiveness. **Purpose**: To identify at least six promising programs and services for evaluation.	
Onsite discussions with program data administrators	Instrument 8: Discussion Guide for Data Administrators	**Participants:** Program data administrators **Content:** Questions are designed to assess the extent to which existing administrative data can be used for evaluation purposes.	**Mode**: In-person, onsite (or virtual platform such as Zoom or Teams). **Duration**: one hour

Other Data Sources and Uses of Information

Administrative data

If relevant and existing administrative data are available (as indicated during interviews for Activity 2), we will arrange to review it during EAs to determine its nature and the extent to which it can be used for evaluation purposes. To do this effectively, we will meet with program data administrators to discuss the data, provide available documentation such as data dictionaries, entity relationship models, dashboards, etc., and/or extract a small sample of it (de-identified) for us to review. This will allow us to identify and address issues of data quality and availability; we will only request documents that are readily available and easily accessible.

Program documents

During activities 2 and 3, we may request that executive directors send the Chafee SOTA team documents that they refer to and are readily available to them to support the information they provide during interviews; this documentation will be used to provide context for the program. In addition, the request will be geared only to those documents that are relevant and readily available. For example, if they note that they have and routinely update a program plan, which details the key aspects of their program (e.g., numbers served, sessions offered, recruitment and outreach), we may ask them to share that with us for reference purposes. Similarly, if they report that they have conducted previous evaluation activities and have those documented in a final report, we may request the final report as well. This request may also include annual reports, and program grant applications or logic models.

A3. Use of Information Technology to Reduce Burden

Activity 1: Program nominations

To facilitate the nomination process, interested respondents will be able to fill out and submit nomination entries by going to a dedicated website. To further simplify the nomination process (particularly for third parties, who may have limited information about the program they are recommending), only four fields on the submission form will be required to submit a response: (1) program name, (2) organization name, (3) city located, (4) state located.

Activity 2: Document requests during interviews with executive directors

Interviews will be conducted by telephone and notes will be taken to capture the information gathered during interviews. As noted above, during activities 2 and 3, we may request that executive directors send the Chafee SOTA team documents that they refer to and are readily available to them to support the information they provide during interviews. If the documents are in an electronic format, we will ask the director to email them to us, or, depending on the nature of the document (e.g., grant applications may include such sensitive information as budgets or salaries), we can also set up a secure site – a File Transfer Protocol or FTP – into which directors can securely upload their documents. At all times, we will only request documents that directors refer to and are easily accessible to them.

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

This is a new project with new respondents, and the data collected are for new purposes. We are collecting program-specific data and, to the best of our knowledge, the data we are seeking do not exist in the form we will need. In assessing readiness of a program for evaluation, we will ask about any existing data systems. If we discover that a given program has existing data that may be useful downstream, we would – in the interest of minimizing burden and reducing duplication – assess whether the existing data can be incorporated into the full evaluation in some manner. This activity will be described in the information collection request that will be prepared and submitted for the larger evaluation at a later date.

A5. Impact on Small Businesses

Every effort has been made to minimize burden on small entities (e.g., no unnecessary requests, reducing the number of data items collected to the least number required to accomplish the objectives of the effort) and to lessen any disruption during site visits to selected programs (activity 3). All three data collection activities detailed in this package are designed to encourage participation by interested respondents. For activities 2 and 3, we will schedule interviews and any onsite data collection at the convenience of the program.

A6. Consequences of Less Frequent Collection

This is a one-time data collection, the goal of which is to identify 5-6 programs to participate in the larger study.

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 the overarching generic clearance for formative information collection. This first notice was published on November 3, 2020, Volume 85, Number 213, page 69627, and provided a sixty-day period for public comment. The second notice published on January 11, 2021, Volume 86, Number 6, page 1978, and provided a thirty-day period for public comment. ACF did not receive any substantive comments.

Consultation with Experts Outside of the Study

Not applicable to this submission.

A9. Tokens of Appreciation

One of the guiding principles of the Chafee SOTA project is the authentic incorporation of youth voice in evaluation activities. Through prior stakeholder engagement, youth have strongly emphasized the importance of providing tokens of appreciation to demonstrate that the expertise of youth with lived experience is valued. It is also important for this work to hear from a variety of youth. To be responsive to this feedback and to ensure we are able to recruit enough youth of varied background, we propose to offer youth a token of appreciation for their participation in the focus groups (activity 3). Unlike staff who will participate during work hours, youth will participate in the 1.5 hour focus groups on their own time. As such, we propose to provide a token of appreciation of $40 (in cash, if onsite, and as a Visa gift code, if virtual) to each participant (whether the group is onsite or virtual) to offset potential incidental costs of participation and/or travel expenses to get them to the site for onsite groups. Westat has used the amount to effectively engage similar program participants in other evaluation projects.

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

Personally Identifiable Information

To engage and interact with interview and focus group participants, we will need to collect their names and contact information, including email addresses and, for executive directors only, telephone numbers. For focus group participants, this information will only be gathered and kept for the purposes of contacting individuals to schedule data collection activities; it will be deleted once data collection ends. The only remaining information will be the category of respondent to which they belonged (i.e., partner agency staff, program staff, etc.); it will be important to distinguish partner agency staff from the primary agency staff when analyzing the data given the different roles they play in the programs under evaluation. Contact information for executive directors will be kept throughout the nomination and selection process for ongoing communication. If their program is selected for evaluation, their information will be maintained until the end of the project. If they are not selected, their information will be deleted. Contact information will not be shared outside of the research team.

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 wholly 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.

To assist with notetaking and ensure that participant responses and comments are captured in full, Activity 3 interviews and focus groups will be audio-recorded. Activity 3 participants will be presented with informed consent detailing the intention to record the interview or focus group. All audio recordings will be destroyed following transcription.

Data Security and Monitoring

In addition to OMB approval, the Chafee SOTA team will obtain IRB approval for the activities (data collection processes, as well as instruments and consent forms) described in this application (activities 1, 2, and 3) through the Westat IRB.[3] The IRB review will occur after OMB approval is obtained. In general, Westat's IRB defaults to the OMB approval process; that is, for any Westat project that requires OMB approval, the IRB generally accepts what OMB approves as final. The team has multiple procedures in place to protect and ensure respondent privacy. All data collection efforts have informed consent processes that will be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to implementation. All project staff, including subcontractors and consultants, are required to sign confidentiality agreements, and all studies are reviewed by the IRB to ensure compliance with applicable regulations that protect human subjects. All electronic exchanges of data will be transmitted via a secure website. Westat's security protocols include maintaining all electronic data (e.g., data files, recordings), source documents, and any forms or lists that contain confidential or private information within secure areas that are locked or password-protected. The Chafee SOTA team will not disclose data or information to any person, organization, or agency other than those specifically authorized or prescribed by contractual procedures.

During focus groups, individuals will be asked to share only their first name or will be told they can choose to use an alias or nickname, if desired. In addition, consent procedures will include language about maintaining the confidentiality of other group participants; that is, by signing the consent form (or, in the case of a virtual focus group, verbally consenting), each participant agrees not to share any information provided in the group with individuals outside of the group. In addition, during interviews, facilitators will know the name of the individual with whom they are meeting. However, any personally

[3] IRB ID 00000695, FWA00005551

identifying information (such as name or title, used together) will not be included on notes, transcripts, or other documentation of the interview.

The Chafee SOTA team shall make every effort to guard references to respondents (including aliases), all information or opinions collected in the course of interviews, and any information about respondents learned incidentally during the project. Hard copies of interview data and notes shall be kept in locked containers or a locked room when not being used. Reasonable caution shall be exercised in limiting access to data to only those persons who are working on the project and who have been instructed in appropriate human subject requirements for the project.

Potentially identifying information (such as an alias or title) will not be part of any machine data record. Electronic files and audio files will be accessible only to project staff and under password-protection. Access to network-based data files is controlled through the use of Access Control Lists or directory- and file-access rights based on user account ID and the associated user group designation, which is maintained by the system administrator. Access control on PCs is achieved for the most part by sound file management procedures by each user. Staff are instructed on the proper use of PCs for the storage, transfer, and use of sensitive information and the tools available, such as encryption.

A11. Sensitive Information [4]

We are not collecting sensitive information.

A12. Burden

Explanation of Burden Estimates

The hours associated for each data collection activity are summarized here:

- Activity 1: Program nominations: We estimate receiving approximately 162 nominations via web and email with a duration of 15 minutes to prepare and submit each nomination.
- Activity 2: Telephone followup interviews with executive directors. We plan to conduct interviews with 36 executive directors for up to 60 minutes.
- Activity 3 Data Collection
    - Onsite interviews with executive directors: We plan to conduct in-person interviews with 9 executive directors for up to 90 minutes.

[4] 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.

- Onsite interviews with partner agency executive directors: We plan to conduct in-person interviews with 3 partner agency executive directors for up to 90 minutes.
- Onsite discussions with program data administrators: We plan to conduct in-person discussions with 1 program data administrator per program; discussions will take one hour.
- Onsite focus groups with:
  - Program staff: We plan to conduct two focus groups per program (n=9) with 8 participants in each for a total (and maximum) of 144 respondents; focus groups will take up to 90 minutes.
  - Partner agency staff: We plan to conduct two focus groups per program (n=9) with 8 participants in each for a total (and maximum) of 144 respondents; focus groups will take up to 90 minutes.
  - Program participants (18 years of age or older): We plan to conduct one focus group per program (n=9) with 8 participants in each for a total (and maximum) of 72 participants; focus groups will take up to 90 minutes.

Exhibit A12-1 shows the estimated annualized burden hours for the respondents' time to participate in each data collection activity. Across the data collection, the total annualized burden is estimated to be 645 hours.

Estimated Annualized Cost to Respondents

Exhibit A12-1 also shows the estimated annualized cost burden associated with the participants' time to take part in the data collection. The annualized cost burden is estimated to be **$15,415.91**.

We estimated the hourly costs per response using the May 2021 Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics median hourly wages for the labor categories Social and Community Service Managers (for executive directors = $36.92) and Child, Family, and School Social Workers (for program and partner agency staff = $26.39)[5]. The youth hourly wage is based on the federal minimum wage of $7.25/hour. The Call for Nominations is estimated using an average of the three labor rates presented in the table (see footnote 6 for a full explanation).

[5] **Source:** Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics (May 2021), https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oessrci.htm

Exhibit A12-1. Estimated Hour and Cost Burden of 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/ Annual Burden (in hours)	Avg. Hourly Wage Rate	Total Annual Respondent Cost
Activity 1 Data Collection						
Call for Nominations	162	1	.25	41	$23.52[6]	$964.32
Activity 2 Data Collection						
Followup Questions for Executive Directors	36	1	1	36	$36.92	$1329.12
Activity 3 Data Collection						
EA Interview Guide for Executive Directors	9	1	1.5	14	$36.92	$516.88
EA Interview Guide for Partner Agency Directors	3	1	1.5	5	$36.92	$184.60
EA Focus Group Guide for Program Staff	144	1	1.5	216	$26.39	$5700.24
EA Focus Group Guide for Partner Agency Staff	144	1	1.5	216	$26.39	$5700.24
EA Focus Group Guide for Youth Participants	72	1	1.5	108	$7.25	$783.00
EA Discussions with Program Data Administrators	9	1	1	9	$26.39	$237.51
Total	**579**			**645**		**$15,415.91**

A13. Costs

There are no additional costs to respondents.

A14. Estimated Annualized Costs to the Federal Government

The estimated cost to the federal government of the planned work under the contract for this request is summarized in Exhibit 3. Costs to plan and implement project management, stakeholder engagement, expert consultations, and travel for activity 3 are already estimated in the budget approved for this contract (under Task 7).

Exhibit A-3: Estimated Annualized Costs

[6] It is difficult to predict the labor category of those individuals who submit nominations. As such, we have used an average of the three labor rates presented in this table to account for the range of labor categories that may submit nominations (e.g., directors, staff, youth).

Cost Category	Estimated Costs
Activities 1, 2 and 3	$ 118,547
Travel related to Activity 3	$ 14,904
Total/Annual costs	$133,451

A15. Reasons for changes in burden

This is for an individual information collection under the umbrella formative generic clearance for ACF research (0970-0356).

A16. Timeline:

The table below shows the timeline for data collection under this submission, once the team receives OMB approval.

Task	Timeframe (after OMB approval)
Solicit Nominations	Months 1-2
Identify Programs	Months 2-4
Submit for and receive IRB approval for Evaluability Assessments	Months 4-5
Conduct Evaluability Assessments	Months 6-8
Program Recommendations	Months 8-9

A17. Exceptions

No exceptions are necessary for this information collection.

Attachments

Instrument 1 – Call for Nominations
Instrument 2 – Followup Questions for Nominated Program Executive Directors
Instrument 3 – EA Interview Guide for Nominated Program Executive Directors
Instrument 4 – EA Interview Guide for Partner Agency Executive Directors
Instrument 5 – EA Focus Group Guide for Nominated Program Staff
Instrument 6 – E Focus Group Guide for Partner Agency Staff
Instrument 7 – EA Focus Group Guide for Youth Participants
Instrument 8 – EA Discussion Guide for Data Administrators

Appendix A- Advance Emails
Appendix B – Interview Emails
Appendix C – Focus Group Emails
Appendix D – Consent Forms