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

GenIC: Supporting Family Economic Well-Being through Home Visiting (HomeEc)

Under

Umbrella Generic Clearance:
Formative Data Collections for ACF Research

0970 – 0356

Supporting Statement

Part A

November 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 Officer:
Pooja Gupta Curtin

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 for a generic information collection (GenIC) under the umbrella generic, Formative Data Collections for ACF Research (0970-0356).
- **Description of Request:**

  The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) seeks approval for a one-time information collection to better understand, measure, and inform improvements to the economic well-being of families enrolled in early childhood home visiting (ECHV) programs. The information collection is part of the study, Supporting Family Economic Well-Being through Home Visiting (HomeEc), which will explore definitions of family economic well-being, identify home visiting practices to support such well-being, and describe how programs measure it.

  The information collection will include interviews and focus groups with program staff and parent participants in six purposively selected sites to understand how the ECHV practitioners and families define family economic well-being and its components, how local ECHV programs support family economic well-being, and how these programs measure family economic well-being. The collected information will inform development of measures of economic well-being of the families that programs such as these serve and a formative rapid-cycle evaluation of identified supports and practices in other similar ECHV programs. We do not intend for this information to be used directly as the principal basis for public policy decisions.

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

A1. Necessity for Collection

Family economic well-being—including financial, material, and socio-emotional resources—can be an important support for families' long-term stability, family functioning, and children's healthy development. The evidence that home visiting has favorable effects on family economic well-being is promising but limited. Given the connections between economic stability, parenting, and caregiver well-being, a stronger focus on family economic well-being in home visiting could benefit families in many ways. The Supporting Family Economic Well-Being through Home Visiting (HomeEc) study aims to better understand the ways in which ECHV programs can and do support family economic well-being. The HomeEc study is focused on local ECHV programs, meaning programs that employ home visitors directly and who provide home visiting services to expectant parents or families with young children within their local area. There are no legal or administrative requirements that necessitate this collection. ACF is funding the HomeEc study and undertaking the collection at the discretion of the agency. ACF has contracted with Mathematica to complete this study.

A2. Purpose

Purpose and Use

ECHV programs provide individualized support services to families with expectant parents or young children by pairing families up with a home visitor, who is typically a trained nurse, social worker, or early childhood educator. These home visitors provide support to parents and their children by assessing their needs; screening for areas of risk; providing supportive services related to maternal, child, and family health and development; and connecting these families with services in the local community.

Local ECHV programs often receive their funding from a variety of sources at the local, state, or federal levels. For example:

- The Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting program (MIECHV) is the largest source of federal funding for ECHV programs. These funds are awarded to states, territories, or nonprofit organizations, which then disburse the funds to local ECHV programs.
- The Tribal MIECHV program provides federal funding for ECHV to federally recognized Indian tribes, tribal organizations and urban Indian organizations; these funds are then disbursed to local ECHV programs serving American Indian and Alaska Native families.
- Other federal funding sources may include Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, Social Services Block Grant, Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention Grants, Title IV-B (Social Security Act) and Title IV-E (Family First Prevention Services Act), the Title V Maternal and Child Health Block Grant Program, Medicaid, and the Child Care and Development Block Grant.
- Local ECHV programs may receive funding at the state and local level from sources such as state tax revenue or private philanthropic entities. This funding may supplement federal funding sources or be the primary funding source for some local ECHV programs (Healthy Families America, 2020).

ECHV programs typically serve families with children five years or younger or pregnant people. Some ECHV programs have additional eligibility criteria or focal characteristics. For example, programs that receive MIECHV funding aim to serve pregnant women and parents with children up to kindergarten entry who are living in at-risk communities. These at-risk communities could have concentrations of premature birth, low-birth weight infants, infant mortality or other indicators of at-risk pre-natal, maternal, newborn or child health; poverty; crime; domestic violence; high rates of high-school drop-outs; substance misuse; unemployment; or child maltreatment. Families who receive ECHV services vary

in their racial and ethnic background, their levels of family economic well-being, and their family structure (National Home Visiting Resource Center 2022).

The information collection conducted as part of the HomeEc study has three complementary purposes. The first is to understand how ECHV practitioners and families served by local ECHV programs define family economic well-being and its key components. The second is to describe how selected local ECHV programs support family economic well-being in areas such as stable employment, adequate income to meet short- and long-term needs, and coping with financial stress. These practices are often not captured in the existing literature. The third purpose of the HomeEc study is to understand how these local ECHV programs measure the economic well-being of the families they serve and to understand how comfortable families are providing information about their economic well-being to program staff. Given the relationship between economic stability, parental well-being, and parenting (Evans and Garthwaite 2014; Gershoff et al. 2007; Lugo-Gil and Tamis-LeMonda 2008), a stronger focus on family economic well-being in home visiting might benefit families in a number of ways.

Mathematica will summarize the findings in a memo for ACF. The results will be used by the project to inform other activities such as:

- Developing and revising a conceptual model, which ACF can use to illustrate the pathways for home visiting to support family economic well-being
- Using rapid-cycle formative evaluation to assess the fit and feasibility of practices designed to improve family economic well-being in existing ECHV programs
- Identifying, adapting, or developing multifaceted measures of family economic well-being that can be used in home visiting research and/or practice in the field
- Testing the reliability and validity of the measures with a diverse set of participants
- Conducting activities on special topics to be determined, such as further exploring work done in other tasks or pursuing related topics that emerge as priorities for HHS and ACF.

Note that any resulting activities that include information collection that is subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval.

This proposed information collection is consistent with 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 during this GenIC is meant to contribute to the body of knowledge on ACF programs. It is not intended to be used directly 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 in its current form.

Exhibit 1. This GenIC will contribute to, but not alone answer, these HomeEc research questions

1. What are the components of economic well-being?

a. What does family economic well-being look like?
b. What economic strengths and challenges do the families served by local ECHV programs often face?
c. What economic well-being goals do families often have?
d. How does a family's economic well-being influence their parenting behaviors and health?

2. What supports can a local ECHV program provide to help families achieve economic well-being?
   a. What role does a local ECHV program play in supporting a family's economic well-being?
   b. To what resources do home visitors connect families to support their economic well-being? What barriers do families encounter?
   c. What types of training and supports are available to support program staff as they help families achieve economic well-being?
   d. What facilitators and challenges do home visitors encounter in supporting a family's economic well-being?
   e. What are the most important supports and activities a program can provide to support a family's economic well-being? What are the challenges to providing those supports?
   f. How often do families drop out from local ECHV programs after achieving their economic well-being goals?
   g. What strategies have worked to retain families after achieving their economic well-being goals?
3. How is economic well-being measured?
   a. What measures of family economic well-being do local ECHV programs collect?
   b. How do local ECHV programs use data from those measures?
   c. What else would programs like to know about families' economic well-being? How, if at all, would programs use information from such a measure?
   d. How comfortable are families providing information about their family economic well-being to local ECHV programs?

Study Design

The activities proposed in this GenIC include collecting data from local ECHV program staff and participating parents through in-depth, semi-structured interviews and focus groups to contribute to our understanding about how staff and parents understand family economic well-being, the range of practices local ECHV programs use to support family economic well-being, and how local ECHV programs measure such well-being.

We will engage members of our technical work group (TWG) and federal partners to nominate up to 10 local ECHV programs from which to recruit 6 for the information collection. We will also draw on information from other project activities to inform the nomination decisions, including the following:

- The project's literature review, to identify measures and practices related to family economic well-being
- The project's review of available documents about programs that support family economic well-being, to identify up to eight promising practices to support family economic well-being that could be tested in ECHV agencies
- The conceptual model that identifies key elements of family economic well-being and the mechanisms by which ECHV programs can support it

We will prioritize the recruitment and selection of local ECHV programs that are implementing clearly defined strategies to support family economic well-being, particularly if those strategies show evidence of effectiveness. More details about the purposive program selection criteria are in Section B2 of Part B under "*Site Selection and Respondent Recruitment*."

Following OMB approval, we will conduct calls to screen and recruit 6 local ECHV programs for data collection; we will cease recruitment when 6 eligible programs have agreed to participate. We will work with program leadership to identify and recruit supervisors for interviews and home visitors for group interviews. We will work with program staff to identify and recruit parent participants for the interviews and focus groups. More information about how we will conduct the preliminary selection of up to 10 local ECHV programs, the recruitment of 6 of those local ECHV programs, and their staff and parent participants is in Section B2 of Part B under "*Site Selection and Respondent Recruitment*."

We will conduct a document review of program materials related to family economic well-being practices. We will conduct virtual semi-structured individual interviews with up to 12 ECHV program directors and up to 12 supervisors across six programs, and up to 14 parent participants across up to six local ECHV programs. We will conduct virtual semi-structured group interviews with up to 36 home visitors across six local ECHV programs and virtual focus groups with up to 36 parent participants across the six local ECHV programs. Using both focus groups and interviews with parent participants will allow us to collect complementary data. The focus groups facilitate collecting information from more families about less personal topics, such as how they define family economic well-being and how it impacts family relationships and dynamics. The interviews facilitate more in-depth conversation about each topic, such as more detailed information on a family's economic well-being and experience with the local ECHV program. Please see Table A.1 for a description of the contents and purpose of each data collection instrument. Additional information about the proposed respondents is in Section B2 of Part B under "*Site Selection and Respondent Recruitment*."

We have proposed a purposive sample and qualitative approaches to collecting data, as these methods provide the flexibility needed to fully understand how home visiting programs select and implement strategies to support family economic well-being. The study's key potential limitation is that, despite purposive selection, the local ECHV programs included in the data collection might not ultimately include the full range of family economic well-being components or the ways home visiting programs measure it. The home visiting participants included in the data collection might not include the full range of experiences in local ECHV programs; participants included in the data collection might be more likely to be comfortable discussing their family economic well-being than the average home visiting participant. We will acknowledge this limitation when sharing findings from the study. More details about the rationale of our study design are available in Section B1 of Part B under "*Appropriateness of Study Design and Methods for Planned Uses*."

Table A.1. Data collection activities

Data collection activity	Instruments	Respondent, content, purpose of collection	Mode and duration
Program recruitment script and eligibility screening	Instrument 1: Program recruitment and eligibility screener	**Respondents:** Program directors **Content:** Information about the overall study and planned data collection activities. Questions related to eligibility criteria and interest in study participation **Purpose:** Collect information about program	**Mode:** Telephone **Duration:** 45 minutes

Data collection activity	Instruments	Respondent, content, purpose of collection	Mode and duration
		eligibility based on a set of established eligibility criteria; gauge the program's interest and capacity to participate in the current study as well as a possible future study	

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

Data collection activity	Instruments	Respondent, content, purpose of collection	Mode and duration
Semi-structured interviews	Instrument 2: **Program director** interview protocol	**Respondents**: Program directors **Content**: Program and participant characteristics; components of family economic well-being; strategies for supporting family economic well-being; community partner and service provider collaboration; program improvement recommendations **Purpose**: Understand the program director's perspective on the different components of family economic well-being and how programs are measuring it; understand the different strategies programs use to support family economic well-being and opportunities for service improvement	**Mode**: Video or telephone conference **Duration**: 60 minutes
	Instrument 3: **Program supervisor** interview protocol	**Respondents**: Program supervisors **Content**: Program, staff, community, and participant characteristics; components of family economic well-being; strategies for supporting family economic well-being; professional and community resources; program improvement recommendations **Purpose**: Understand the program supervisor's perspective on the different components of family economic well-being and how programs are measuring it; understand the different strategies programs use to support family economic well-being and opportunities for service improvement (for example, the need to address additional components or adapt for families served)	**Mode**: Video or telephone conference **Duration**: 60 minutes
	Instrument 4: **Parent participant** interview protocol	**Respondents:** Home visiting program parent participants (*who do not participate in a parent participant focus group*); could be current or recent participants **Content:** Home visiting program usage; community characteristics; family goals, strengths, and challenges; family economic well-being; services for supporting family economic well-being; recommendations for program improvement **Purpose:** Gain an in-depth understanding of families' economic and community context, their economic well-being goals and achievements, their interactions with the program; the components of family economic well-being considered most important by different families; the different strategies programs use to support it; opportunities for service improvement	**Mode:** Video or telephone conference **Duration:** 60 minutes

Data collection activity	Instruments	Respondent, content, purpose of collection	Mode and duration
	Instrument 5: **Home visitor** group interview protocol	**Respondents:** Home visitors **Content:** Program, staff, community, and client characteristics; components of family economic well-being; strategies for supporting family economic well-being; professional and community resources; program improvement recommendations **Purpose:** Understand the home visitors' perspectives on the different components of family economic well-being and how programs are measuring it; understand how they use the different strategies to support family economic well-being and opportunities for service improvement. The group interview format (of 2-3 home visitors) will allow for a more in-depth conversation about each topic compared to a focus group.	**Mode:** Video or telephone conference **Duration:** 90 minutes
Focus groups	Instrument 6: **Parent participant** focus group guide	**Respondents:** Home visiting program parent participants (*who did not participate in a parent participant interview*); could be current or recent participants **Content:** Home visiting program usage; family goals, strengths, and challenges; family economic well-being; services for supporting family economic well-being; recommendations for program improvement **Purpose:** Gain a general understanding of which strategies families find most acceptable and consider most helpful; learn family perceptions of how these strategies "fit" within the other goals for their home visiting programs; opportunities for service improvement	**Mode:** Video or telephone conference **Duration:** 60 minutes

Other Data Sources and Uses of Information

This proposed data collection will be used in conjunction with other project activities to achieve the goals of the project. Project activities include the following:

- Conducting literature and document reviews to identify components of family economic well-being; practices that support family economic well-being through home visiting; and existing measures of family economic well-being
- Developing a conceptual model of how home visiting services can improve family economic well-being

A3. Use of Information Technology to Reduce Burden

We will conduct all data collection remotely via telephone or video conferencing software. After obtaining permission from each participant, we will audio-record all interviews and focus groups to capture information accurately without requiring participants to repeat themselves. We will use the recording to supplement the notes we take during the staff interviews and focus groups; we will transcribe the parent participant interviews, as there won't be a notetaker present in those interviews.

A4. Use of Existing Data: Efforts to Reduce Duplication, Minimize Burden, and Increase Utility and Government Efficiency

Our examination of work in this area has not identified other current or planned efforts to collect information to understand definitions of family economic well-being, home visiting strategies used to support such well-being, or measures of family economic well-being that local ECHV programs use.

The data collection plan is designed to obtain information efficiently and minimize respondent burden. Although there is overlap in the overarching topics found in the interview protocols and focus group guides, we will ask specific respondent groups different subsets of questions within each topic. We will ask similar questions across respondent groups only when it is valuable to obtain a variety of perspectives on a subtopic. When feasible, we will gather information from existing data sources (for example, using census data to identify potential client characteristics). None of the study instruments ask for information that can be obtained from alternative data sources (including administrative data). We will use publicly available information and that provided by TWG members and federal partners to identify and select local ECHV programs. The design of the study instruments minimizes duplication of data collected across instruments; such duplication will be necessary only when we need the perspective of more than one type of respondent, or when we need to go in-depth on topics with a subset of respondents (such as the parent participant interviews), to answer specific research questions.

A5. Impact on Small Businesses

Most local ECHV programs will be small organizations. These are programs that employ home visitors and provide direct services to families in their local communities. We are sensitive to the burden that qualitative data collection can impose; we will work flexibly around staff availability in scheduling interviews and focus groups to minimize the impact of participation on these programs.

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

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

To complement the knowledge and experience of the study team, we have and/or will consult with the expert advisors listed below:

Table A.2. HomeEc expert advisors

Name	Position and affiliation	Expertise
Teresa Eckrich Sommer	Research professor, Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University	Economic well-being; early childhood
Lisa A. Gennetian	Co-investigator, The National Research Center on Hispanic Children and Families, Professor at Duke University	Economic well-being; behavioral economics; early childhood
Chelsea Wesner	Family Economic Well-Being Lead, Tribal Research Center on Early Childhood Development and Systems	Tribal communities; early childhood; maternal and child health; nutrition
Deana Around Him	Senior Research Scientist, Child Trends	Tribal communities; early childhood; home visiting; service delivery
Jeanna Capito	Co-lead of Rapid Response Virtual Home Visiting Project, Facilitator of the National Alliance of Home Visiting Models	Home visiting; service delivery; early childhood
Karen Guskin	Managing Director of Health Families America Research, Health Families America	Home visiting; service delivery; early childhood
Daphne Colacion	Program Coordinator, Lake County Tribal Health Consortium	Home visiting; economic well-being; service delivery; early childhood; tribal communities
Sarita Rogers	Deputy Director of Programs, The Children's Trust	Home visiting; economic well-being; service delivery; early childhood
April Winters	Family Support Specialist, Tiwa Babies, Division of Health & Community Services Taos Pueblo	Home visiting; tribal communities; service delivery; early childhood
Allison Parish	Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting TA Resource Center director, Education Development Center	Home visiting; infant mental health; technical assistance
Sophia Taula-Lieras	Project director, ZERO TO THREE	Home visiting; economic well-being; tribal communities; mental health

A9. Tokens of Appreciation

Participation in the HomeEc study data collection will place some additional burdens or barriers on parents who attend the virtual interviews or focus groups, such as possibly needing to secure child care to participate. To offset this burden and related incidental costs, and to acknowledge respondents' efforts in a respectful way, the study team proposes to offer parents participating in a one-hour

interview or focus group a $35 gift card as a token of appreciation for their participation. Parents who are receiving ECHV services are not obligated to participate in research studies such as HomeEc.

Although these data are not intended to be representative of the larger population of participants, it is critical to secure participation to understand the perspectives of the people who are the intended recipients of ECHV services. This study seeks to collect information from families who vary in their racial and ethnic background, their levels of family economic well-being, family structure, and experiences in the local ECHV programs. Without offering the proposed tokens of appreciation, there is risk of securing information only from participants most able to overcome barriers to participation or have the highest levels of family economic well-being. This token is intended to offset costs of participation, such as technology costs (e.g. phone minutes, data plan, etc.), childcare, transportation to the program office or other location with stable internet access, or other expenses, and to help ensure that individuals with more constraints on their ability to participate may take part. Offering in-kind incentives, such as childcare, is not feasible or practical because the data collection is virtual and we cannot anticipate all barriers to participation each family might face. In addition, offering these tokens of appreciation is consistent with Section 8 of the Executive Order on Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government.[1]Previous research has shown that tokens of appreciation improve survey response rates regardless of modality (i.e., web, mail, phone) and can help mitigate nonresponse bias, particularly from minority and low-income respondents (Singer & Ye, 2013).
We will work with the ECHV programs to schedule the parent interviews and focus groups on dates and times that work best for the parents.

A10. Privacy: Procedures to Protect Privacy of Information, While Maximizing Data Sharing

Personally Identifiable Information

We will be collecting individual contact information to send tokens of appreciation to parents who complete the parent participant interviews or focus groups. We will also work with each local ECHV program to collect individual contact information for the program directors, supervisors, and home visitors so we can schedule interviews. We will not maintain information in a paper or electronic system from which data can be actually or directly retrieved by an individual's personal identifier.

Assurances of Privacy

Prior to conducting the staff interviews and parent participant interviews and focus groups, we will distribute consent forms to all participants, which includes language informing respondents about the planned uses of the data we collect, that their participation is voluntary, that they may withdraw their consent to participate at any time without any negative consequences, and that their information will be kept private to the extent permitted by law. We will collect respondents' verbal consent at the start of the interviews and focus groups.

Interviews and focus groups for all respondents will be recorded with their permission; no one other than the research team will listen to the recording; the transcription team will listen to the parent participant interviews so they can transcribe them. If respondents want to say anything that they would

[1] https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/20/executive-order-advancing-racial-equity-and-support-for-underserved-communities-through-the-federal-government/

prefer not to have recorded, they can ask the interviewer to pause the recorder. We will transcribe all focus groups and take notes during the interviews; the recordings and interview notes will be saved on a secure server and destroyed after the study.

Although we will not ask for any sensitive information, respondents may reveal information about themselves and challenges they are facing; hence, we obtained a Certificate of Confidentiality, which helps to assure all interview and focus group participants that their information will be kept private to the fullest extent permitted by law. Further, all materials to be used with respondents as part of this information collection, including consent statements and instruments, have been submitted to and approved by the Health Media Lab Institutional Review Board (Contractor's IRB).

Data Security and Monitoring

As specified in the contract, the Contractor shall protect respondent privacy to the extent permitted by law and will comply with all federal and departmental regulations for private information. The Contractor has developed a Data Safety and Monitoring Plan that assesses all protections of respondents' personally identifiable information (PII). 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.

As specified in the contract, the Contractor shall use encryption compliant with the Federal Information Processing Standard (Security Requirements for Cryptographic Module, as amended) to protect all information during storage and transmission. The Contractor shall securely generate and manage encryption keys to prevent unauthorized decryption of information, in accordance with the Federal Processing Standard. The Contractor shall ensure that this standard is incorporated into the Contractor's property management/control system and establish a procedure to account for all laptop computers, desktop computers, and other mobile devices and portable media that store or process sensitive information. Any data stored electronically will be secured in accordance with the most current National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) requirements and other applicable federal and departmental regulations. In addition, the Contractor must submit a plan for helping ensure secure storage and limits on access.

A11. Sensitive Information[2]

No sensitive information is requested through this information collection.

A12. Burden

Explanation of Burden Estimates

Table A.3 presents an estimate of time burden for the data collections, broken down by instrument and respondent. These estimates are based on our experience with collecting information, interviewing professional staff, and conducting focus groups.

[2] 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.

Estimated Annualized Cost to Respondents

The study team based the average hourly wage estimates for deriving total annual costs on data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Usual Weekly Earnings of Wage and Salary Workers* (2022 first quarter). For each instrument in Table A.3, the team calculated the total annual cost by multiplying the annual burden hours by the average hourly wage.

We used the mean hourly wage of $30.68 for women in professional and related occupations for program staff, as we expect many of the staff working in these positions to be women. We used the mean hourly wage of $17.78 for women high school graduates with no college for parent participants participating in the interviews and focus groups. Tables from which these wages were drawn are available at the following links:

- Program staff (program directors, supervisors, and home visitors): USUAL WEEKLY EARNINGS OF WAGE AND SALARY WORKERS FIRST QUARTER 2022 (bls.gov) (Table 4)
- Parents participating in focus groups: USUAL WEEKLY EARNINGS OF WAGE AND SALARY WORKERS FIRST QUARTER 2022 (bls.gov) (Table 5)

Table A.3. Estimated annualized cost to respondents

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
Program recruitment script and eligibility screener (Instrument 1)	10	1	0.75	8	$30.68	$245.44
Program director interview protocol (Instrument 2)	12	1	1	12	$30.68	$368.16
Program supervisor interview protocol (Instrument 3)	12	1	1	12	$30.68	$368.16
Parent participant interview protocol (Instrument 4)	14	1	1	14	$17.78	$248.92
Home visitor group interview protocol (Instrument 5)	36	1	1.5	54	$30.68	$1,656.72

Parent participant focus group guide (Instrument 6)	36	1	1	36	$17.78	$640.08
Total	-	-	-	136	-	$3,527.148

A13. Costs

We propose to offer each participating local ECHV program an honorarium to acknowledge their contribution to timely and complete data collection, and in recognition that their efforts in helping to coordinate study activities and recruit parent participants for focus groups and interviews. Although these local ECHV programs may receive funding from federal or state sources, they are typically not the grantees for federal funds. These local ECHV programs are not obligated to participate in research studies, regardless of their funding sources. An honorarium would help increase the likelihood of their participation by defraying the cost of participating, such as using staff time for interviews, rather than their regular job responsibilities.[3]

We will offer each participating local home visiting program a $300 honorarium to be used by the program at their discretion for their assistance with a range of study activities as well as recognition of the staff's contribution to this important research effort. We will request the program director's assistance in identifying appropriate respondents (supervisors and home visitors) for the staff interviews and the program's assistance in recruiting parent participants for the interviews and focus groups. Obtaining a wide range of perspectives at each selected local home visiting program is crucial to the success of this study; therefore, we are aiming for a high level of participation by staff in the interviews and parent participants in the interviews and focus groups. We anticipate these coordination activities to take about 6 hours per program. To develop honoraria amounts, we considered wage data, the amount of time spent to assist in data collection activities, and the potential disruption to the schedules of the targeted respondents for participation.

A14. Estimated Annualized Costs to the Federal Government

Table A.4. Estimated annualized costs to the federal government

Activity	Detail	Estimated Cost
Pilot and User Testing	• FTE time: 22 hours • Operational expenses include overhead expenses • Other expenses which would not have been incurred without this collection of information	$3,712
Data collection and analysis	• FTE time: 1,224 hours • Operational expenses include postage, overhead	$171,608

[3] Grantees also are not required to participate in this federally-funded research. The MIECHV grants notice of funding opportunity described data sharing and evaluation requirements, which included grantees submitting data for required federal reporting and conducting a rigorous evaluation of a home visiting model that HRSA categories as "promising" rather than "evidence-based" (HRSA 2021). For more information, also see MIECHV Evaluation & Research | MCHB (hrsa.gov).

	expenses, respondent payments • Other expenses which would not have been incurred without this collection of information	
Initial dissemination	• FTE time: 176 hours • Operational expenses include overhead expenses • Other expenses which would not have been incurred without this collection of information	$30,057
	Total/annual costs over the request period	$206,377

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

Table A.5. HomeEc study timeline

Project activity	Time period
Recruitment	3 months, following OMB approval
Data collection	5 months, following recruitment
Analysis	3 months, following data collection
Reporting	4 months, following analysis

A17. Exceptions

No exceptions are necessary for this information collection.

Attachments (Instruments)

Instrument 1: Program Recruitment Script and Eligibility Screener

Instrument 2: Program Director Interview Protocol

Instrument 3: Program Supervisor Interview Protocol

Instrument 4: Parent Participant Interview Protocol

Instrument 5: Home Visitor Group Interview Protocol

Instrument 6: Parent Participant Focus Group Guide

Appendices

Appendix A: Health Resources and Services Administration Letter of Support

Appendix B: Tribal Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Letter of Support

Appendix C: Program Director Recruitment Email

Appendix D: Study FAQs for Program Staff

Appendix E: Consent Form for Parent Participant Interview

Appendix F: Consent Form for Parent Participant Focus Group

Appendix G: Consent Form for Home Visitor Interview

Appendix H: Consent Form for Program Director Interview

Appendix I: Consent Form for Supervisor Interview

Appendix J: Study Recruitment Flyer for Parent Participant Interview

Appendix K: Study Recruitment Flyer for Parent Participant Focus Group

Appendix L: Study Recruitment Flyer for Program Staff Interviews

References

Evans, William N., and Craig L. Garthwaite. "Giving Mom a Break: The Impact of Higher EITC Payments on Maternal Health." *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2014, pp. 258-290.

Gershoff, E., J. Aber, C. Raver, and M. Lennon. "Income Is Not Enough: Incorporating Material Hardship into Models of Income Associations with Parenting and Child Development." *Child Development*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2007, pp. 70-95. Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.00986.x.

Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). "Notice of funding opportunity: Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program – Formula." Funding Opportunity Number: HRSA-21-050." 2021. Accessed on March 22, 2023 from https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/view-opportunity.html?oppId=329949.

Healthy Families America. "Supporting Home Visiting: A Guide to State and Federal Funding." June 2020. Available at: https://preventchildabuse.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/State-and-Federal-Funding-Streams.pdf.

Lugo-Gil, J., and C.S. Tamis-LeMonda. "Family Resources and Parenting Quality: Links to Children's Cognitive Development Across the First 3 Years." *Child Development*, vol. 79, no. 4, 2008, pp. 1065-1085.2.

Michalopoulos, C., K. Faucetta, C. Hill, X. Portilla, L. Burrell, H. Lee, A. Duggan, et al. "Impacts on Family Outcomes of Evidence-Based Early Childhood Home Visiting: Results from the Mother and Infant Home Visiting Program Evaluation." OPRE Report #2019-07. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2019.

National Home Visiting Resource Center. "2022 Home Visiting Yearbook: Who Is Being Served?." Arlington, VA: James Bell Associates and the Urban Institute, 2022. https://nhvrc.org/yearbook/2022-yearbook/who-is-being-served/

Singer, Eleanor and Cong Ye. "The Use and Effects of Incentives in Surveys." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 645, no. 1, 2013, pp. 112-141.