

Supporting Statement for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions
Moving to Work, Asset Building Cohort Evaluation
OMB # 2528-NEW

B. Collections of Information Employing Statistical Methods

The agency should be prepared to justify its decision not to use statistical methods in any case where such methods might reduce burden or improve accuracy of results. When statistical methods are involved, the following documentation should be included with the Supporting Statement -A to the extent that it applies to the methods proposed:

Part B of the Supporting Statement for the Moving to Work, Asset-Building Cohort Evaluation – sponsored by the Office of Policy Development and Research at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) – considers the issues pertaining to Collection of Information Employing Statistical Methods. HUD has contracted with MEF Associates and its subcontractor, Abt Associates Inc., to design the evaluation and develop data collection instruments for it. The evaluation team will conduct 1) an impact study, 2) an implementation study, and 3) a qualitative study.

The Asset-Building Cohort evaluation will describe the programs and policies implemented by the 17 participating PHAs. The evaluation will also test the impact on families of the Opt-Out Savings and Rent Reporting interventions (described in NOTICE PIH 2022-11). The impact of the Opt-Out Savings program on households emergency savings and financial wellbeing will be assessed with a survey of treatment and control groups created through random selection. The impact of the Rent Reporting program on credit scores will be assessed through a randomized controlled trial. The implementation study will document the challenges, successes, and costs in developing, starting up, and running these programs. Finally, the qualitative study will document and analyze the context in which the rent reporting programs are implemented, including understanding the financial lives and perspectives of HUD-assisted residents at PHAs implementing the rent reporting program.

The evaluation relies on multiple data sources, both secondary data (that is, already existing data) and primary data (that is, new data we will collect as part of this evaluation). The secondary data used in the evaluation is primarily HUD administrative data—notably HUD’s PIC database—as well as the data from cohort PHA’s Management Information Systems. The impact study will include a survey of program and control households at sites implementing an opt-out savings program. The survey will be submitted as part of a second PRA package. Second round semi-structured interview guides for the implementation study and 3rd and 4th round semi-structured interview guides for the qualitative study will also be included in the second PRA package.

1. Describe (including a numerical estimate) the potential respondent universe and any sampling or other respondent selection methods to be used. Data on the number of entities (e.g., establishments, State and local government units, households, or persons) in the universe covered by the collection and in the corresponding sample are to be provided in tabular form for the universe as a whole and for each of the strata in the proposed sample. Indicate expected response rates for the collection as a whole. If the collection had been conducted previously, include the actual response rate achieved during the last collection.

Exhibit B-1 provides the number of PHAs, rounds of data collection, respondents per round, and response rate for each primary data collection source.

Exhibit B-1: Sample Sizes and Response Rates by Data Collection Activity

	PHAs	Rounds	Respondents Per Round	Response Rate
Informed Consent Form	6	1	300	100%
Baseline Information Form	6	1	300	100%
PHA Staff Interviews	17	2	51	100%
Implementation Partner Staff Interviews	4	2	12	100%
Resident Implementation Study Interviews	2	2	10	100%
Resident Qualitative Study Interviews	2	4	40	100%
Total			344	100%

All of the data collection in this ICR will be done by Abt Associates and MEF Associates (the “research team”). The research team expects to collect the data from key staff at the 17 study PHAs with 100 percent response rate. The staff to be interviewed will include staff who are most knowledgeable about the PHA’s MTW asset building programs. All PHAs that applied to the MTW Expansion Asset Building Cohort agreed to participate in the evaluation.

2. Describe the procedures for the collection of information including:

- **Statistical methodology for stratification and sample selection,**
- **Estimation procedure,**
- **Degree of accuracy needed for the purpose described in the justification,**
- **Unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures, and**
- **Any use of periodic (less frequent than annual) data collection cycles to reduce burden.**

This submission does not require a statistical methodology plan because the samples are not intended to be the basis for drawing statistical inferences. The sampling of PHAs, PHA staff, partner staff, and residents is purposive.

The PHAs are not intended to represent all PHAs—instead the PHAs in the MTW Expansion are PHAs that volunteered to join the MTW Asset Building Cohort.

The research team will work with each PHA’s Executive Director to identify the most relevant staff to answer the study’s research questions; the PHA staff will also help to identify the partner staff respondents who are most knowledgeable about the PHA’s MTW asset building program.

Residents for the implementation study interviews at two PHAs will also be selected purposively and are not intended to be a representative sample of residents.

Finally, the 300 residents recruited to complete the BIF will all be volunteers and, again, this group will not be statistically representative of any group of HUD-assisted households. The samples in this submission are not intended to be the basis for drawing statistical inferences.

PHA staff and partner organization staff and ten of the resident respondents will only be involved in data collection once. Some PHA staff may be involved in a limited amount of ad-hoc data collection from the research team in the form of short telephone calls or email exchanges, but these are not formal reporting mechanisms, will not follow a standardized script, and will not be burdensome.

The 300 respondents recruited to complete the BIF will be asked to participate in two interviews (resident qualitative interviews) in addition to completing the BIF.

Procedures with Special Populations

We do not believe we will be communicating with people from special populations.

3. Describe methods to maximize response rates and to deal with issues of non-response. The accuracy and reliability of information collected must be shown to be adequate for

intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided for any collection that will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the universe studied.

Baseline information form. Response rates will be maximized by tying the completion of the baseline information form to the process for enrolling in the study. More specifically, immediately after providing their informed consent during the individual enrollment meeting with PHA staff, study participants will complete the Baseline Information Form. Additionally, we will offer all consenting volunteers a small gift card of \$10 for their time going through the informed consent process and completing the BIF.

Interviews with staff, partners, and residents. As the research team plans to engage with sites throughout the planning and implementation process, the study anticipates 100 percent participation among cohort PHAs. We will plan with management at each site to find a time that works for most or all relevant staff. Because the research team will be working closely with PHA program staff to identify participants for Interviews with implementation partner staff and residents, we also expect a response rate for these groups to be near 100 percent.

To avoid non-response bias, we will work with the sites in arranging the visits to try to obtain 100 percent response rate, and given that we will arrange our site visits in cooperation with the programs, we expect that we will be able to conduct interviews at times that all interviewees are available. If needed, we can schedule follow-up calls with those with whom we are unable to meet in person due to unforeseen circumstances. With regards to the focus groups, we will work with sites to find times and locations that will be convenient for potential participants and offer incentives that will help offset costs of transportation and rearranging work schedules, in order to avoid nonresponse bias by only including respondents who are more financially able to attend a focus group. We will share information about the focus groups before visits, so that sites may begin outreach to families and youth well in advance and allow attendees time to coordinate their attendance.

4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to be undertaken. Testing is encouraged as an effective means of refining collections of information to minimize burden and improve utility. Tests must be approved if they call for answers to identical questions from 10 or more respondents. A proposed test or set of test may be submitted for approval separately or in combination with the main collection of information.

Early drafts of the interview protocols have been reviewed by HUD personnel, Abt Associates and MEF Associates staff, our Expert Panel, which includes a former HUD-assisted resident and participant in a rent reporting program, and our project consultants to ensure that the instruments are clear, flow well, and are as concise as possible.

5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on statistical aspects of the design and the name of the agency unit, contractor(s), grantee(s), or other person(s) who will actually collect and/or analyze the information for the agency.

The individuals listed in Exhibit 2 below made a contribution to the design of the evaluation. Baseline Information Form (BIF) data collection will be carried out by PHA staff under supervision of the contractor Abt Associates and its sub-contractor MEF Associates. All other data collection activities described in this document will be carried out directly by the staff of Abt Associates and MEF Associates.

Exhibit 2: Individuals Consulted

Name	Telephone Number	Role in Study
Sam Elkin	703-838-2722	Senior Advisor
Dr. Stephen Nuñez	650-521-4532	Project Director (sub-contractor)
Prof. Susan Clampet-Lundquist	610-660-1680	Expert Panelist
Prof. J. Michael Collins	608-616-0369	Expert Consultant
Dr. Judy Geyer	617-520-2952	Co-Principal Investigator

Inquiries regarding the study's planned analysis should be directed to:

<i>Dr. Judy Geyer</i>	<i>Abt Associates, Co-Principal Investigator</i>	<i>617-520-2952</i>
<i>Elizabeth Rudd, Ph.D.</i>	<i>HUD, Contracting Officer's Representative</i>	<i>202-402-7607</i>