

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

Multi-Site Study of State-Tribal Collaboration in Home Visiting

Formative Data Collections for Program Support

0970 - 0531

Supporting Statement

Part A

June 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:

Aleta Meyer, PhD, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation
Nicole Denmark, PhD, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation

**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 under the umbrella generic, Formative Data Collections for Program Support (0970-0531)
- **Description of Request:** The Multi-Site Study of State-Tribal Collaboration in Home Visiting examines state-tribal collaboration within the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program. We are requesting to conduct interviews with staff from awardees¹ and local partnering agencies serving American Indian and Alaska Native (AIAN) families to learn more about how states receiving MIECHV funding partner with tribes, tribal organizations, and other entities to provide home visiting services to AIAN families. Interviewees will include state administrators, tribal site program managers, state-tribal liaisons, supervising home visitors, and others knowledgeable of the partnership.

This information will be used to inform program guidance, increase the usefulness of support provided to awardees, and inform the development of future research. The data will not be used to generalize to a broader population, and we do not intend for this information to be used as the principal basis for public policy decisions.

¹ MIECHV supports pregnant people and parents with young children through funds to States and Territories to provide evidence-based home visiting. MIECHV funding recipients are referred to as *awardees*.

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

A1. Necessity for Collection

The Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program is administered by the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) in partnership with the Administration for Children and Families (ACF). Many MIECHV awardees provide home visiting services to American Indian and Alaska Native (AIAN) families. In FY 2019, MIECHV awardees served 4,049 AIAN participants, and AIAN participants made up at least 10 percent of total participants in seven of the 50 states funded. MIECHV awardees collaborate with tribal communities through a variety of partnerships including maintaining contracts with local implementing agencies (LIAs) associated with tribal populations such as health departments, school districts, social service organizations, and tribal councils. Additionally, because most AIAN families live outside of reservations and are dispersed within cities and suburbs (Liebler, 2018), many AIAN families may receive MIECHV services through non-tribal organizations.

Although the federal government supports states to partner with tribes to provide services, ACF and HRSA know very little about these collaborations including how they are formed and maintained. To fill this gap in knowledge, ACF funded the Multi-Site Study of State-Tribal Collaboration in Home Visiting (MUSE-STC) to collect information about the scope of current collaborations as mechanisms for serving more AIAN families as well as information on what barriers and supports there may be to creating and sustaining collaborations. This formative data collection is part of a larger contract between the ACF Office of Planning Research, and Evaluation (OPRE) and James Bell Associates/ University of Colorado's Anschutz Medical Campus, Centers for American Indian and Alaska Native Health, called the Multi-Site Implementation Evaluation of Tribal Home Visiting (MUSE), to provide research on how home visiting programs funded by MIECHV are operating across community contexts that serve AIAN families and identify factors that lead to successful implementation, including during the COVID-19 pandemic.

There are no legal or administrative requirements that necessitate or authorize this information collection. ACF is undertaking the collection at the discretion of the agency.

A2. Purpose

Purpose and Use

The purpose of this data collection is to explore the collaborations between MIECHV awardees and tribal communities and their influence on planning and implementation of services. This primary purpose of data collection is to provide descriptive information that will be used by ACF and HRSA to tailor program processes and plan for technical assistance that builds capacity to serve AIAN families. The information will be summarized in an internal memo. As part of the MIECHV Learning Agenda, this information collection will inform future federal research investments by ACF and HRSA related to home visiting in AIAN communities. ACF also intends to use the information to inform a report on state-tribal collaboration, which will be based on a number of project activities such as secondary data analyses, a literature review, and study design options.

This proposed information collection meets the following goals of ACF's generic clearance for formative data collections for program support (0970-0531):

- Refinement of program and grantee processes
- Planning for provision of programmatic or evaluation-related training or technical assistance
- Development of learning agendas and research priorities

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

The information collected is meant to contribute to the body of knowledge on ACF and HRSA 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.

Research Questions

This qualitative, formative data collection seeks to answer eight key research questions that examine four areas of collaboration: formation, structure, function, and effectiveness. By examining the research questions, outlined in Table 1, we will be able to identify successful partnership strategies and barriers to collaboration that can inform both program guidance and technical assistance efforts.

Table 1. Key Research Questions for MUSE-STC

Formation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What do MIECHV awardees and tribal communities consider when deciding whether to partner? 2. How are partnerships between MIECHV awardees and tribal communities established?
Structure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. How are partnerships between MIECHV awardees and tribal communities structured? 4. What are the markers of a well-functioning partnership between MIECHV awardees and tribal communities?
Function	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. How are these partnerships functioning during planning? 6. How are these partnerships functioning during implementation? 7. What are the facilitators and barriers of well-functioning partnerships?
Effectiveness	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. What are the challenges and benefits of these partnerships from the perspective of MIECHV awardees and tribal communities?

Study Design

The study team determined that a case study design is best suited for this project (see Supporting Statement B1 “Appropriateness of Study Design and Methods for Planned Uses” for additional information) as it allows the study team to deeply explore the unique state-tribal partnerships within MIECHV. A case study design focuses on understanding an individual concept or entity (e.g., partnerships) through close examination. The MUSE-STC study team has used existing data and a community-engaged process to identify and characterize the diverse partnership types and select cases² that best represent these types for in-depth analysis. Case selection was driven by an effort to identify the most predominant or salient types of partnerships (determined by number of cases or case specifics). This selection strategy will enable findings that comprehensively describe what is typical for such cases (i.e., state-tribal partnership within MIECHV). By identifying partnerships that are most typical of those found within MIECHV, our team can answer the research questions in ways that are useful for other partnerships within MIECHV who may share many of the characteristics while still highlighting the unique context of each chosen case. The study design will rely on individual key informant interviews with state and tribal agency staff members within each of the cases. Qualitative interviews will allow us to gather in-depth information that can be used to inform supports for MIECHV awardees. Multiple staff from both the awardee and local agencies will be interviewed in order to obtain comprehensive information about how the partnership is experienced from both perspectives.

² Throughout Supporting Statement A and Supporting Statement B, two terms are commonly used: *case* and *site*. Case is defined as the unit of analysis for the study, which is the partnership. Site is the particular agency participating in the partnership and data collection. In most instances, two sites are involved in each case.

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

Table 2 provides a summary of proposed data collection activities. Given that not much is known about these partnerships, a qualitative approach provides the best option for gathering information on new concepts, as opposed to testing assumptions with quantitative methods. As described in SSB, section B1, this study is intended to present internally-valid descriptions only. It is not intended to promote statistical generalization to other sites or program contexts.

Table 2. Summary of Proposed Data Collection Activities

Instruments	Respondents, content, and purpose	Mode, Frequency, and Duration
MUSE-STC Interview Protocol (INSTRUMENT A)	<p>Respondents: Individuals knowledgeable of the state-tribal collaboration; respondents are likely to include the state administrator, tribal site program manager, state-tribal liaison, supervising home visitor, and other staff knowledgeable of partnership</p> <p>Content: The questions will focus on the partnership’s development, how the partnership is structured, how the partnering agencies work together, the impact of the partnership’s work, and facilitators and barriers to successful partnership</p> <p>Purpose: Understanding MIECHV awardee and tribal/local agency staff members’ experiences with collaboration to serve AIAN families and the influence of collaboration on planning and implementation of services</p>	<p>Mode: Interview</p> <p>Frequency: one time</p> <p>Duration: Up to 90 minutes</p>

A3. Use of Information Technology to Reduce Burden

We will contact each respondent via email and telephone to solicit their participation (See APPENDIX A for draft email and call script). Interviews will take place over a secure Zoom platform and will be recorded with participant approval.

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

In order to identify our target population, we reviewed existing data from awardees’ grant applications and needs assessments as well as summary reports created by HRSA and publicly available information from agency websites. Through this review, we identified MIECHV awardees with existing partnerships that serve AIAN communities. We then extracted available information on key characteristics of those partnerships including length of partnership, type of partnering agency (e.g., tribal government, non-tribal agency, etc.), home visiting model, and program size (i.e., budget and caseload). Analysis of these data informed the development of case criteria and eventually case selection (see Supporting Statement B2 “Methods and Design” for additional information).

Study protocols have been designed to gather in-depth information about partnership formation, structure, function and effectiveness, information that is not reported in existing documents and reports.

A5. Impact on Small Businesses

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

The project will include employees of state and tribal human service agencies. We will only request information required for the intended use.

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 a notice in the Federal Register announcing the agency’s intention to request an OMB review of the overarching generic clearance for formative information collection. This notice was published on November 3, 2020 (85 FR 69627), and provided a sixty-day period for public comment. During the notice and comment period, no substantive comments were received. A subsequent notice was published on December 28, 2020 (85 FR 84343) and provided a thirty-day period for public comment. During the notice and comment period, no substantive comments were received.

On January 28, 2022, ACF a notice (87 FR 4603) providing a sixty-day period related to an extension request to this umbrella clearance. No comments were received. ACF will submit a request to extend approval and publish an additional notice allowing a thirty-day period for public comment prior to July 31, 2022.

Consultation with Experts Outside of the Study

We consulted with HRSA and ACF MIECHV program office staff; researchers with expertise in implementation science, state MIECHV systems, and collaboration between state agencies and tribal or local agencies. We also engaged HRSA awardees and local agencies that are partnering to serve tribal communities. These consultations focused on the study aims and questions, study design, case selection criteria, site engagement, and instruments. Table 3 identifies the outside experts who consulted on the MUSE-STC study.

Table 3. Outside Experts Consulting on MUSE-STC

Name	Affiliation
Jacob Davis	Protect Child Abuse North Dakota
Evelyn Dryer	State of Nevada Bureau of Public and Behavioral Health
Kasondra Kugler	Washington State Department of Early Learning
Leslie Lee	MT Department of Public Health and Human Services
Lorraine McKelvey	University of Arkansas
Renee Rogers	Yerington Paiute Tribe
Cathleen Willging	Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation

A9. Tokens of Appreciation

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

We will not provide tokens of appreciation to respondents.

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

Personally Identifiable Information

We will collect and use agency staff names, email addresses, and phone numbers to schedule interviews. This information will not be located in the same file location as interview data or linked to interview data. Access to names, email addresses, and phone numbers of potential interviewees is restricted to only those who need direct access as part of their work on MUSE-STC. 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

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. We will comply with all federal and departmental regulations for private information. We shall ensure that all our employees, subcontractors (at all tiers), and employees of each subcontractor, who perform work under this contract/subcontract, are trained annually on data privacy and security and comply with the above requirements. Interviews will be audio-recorded. Audio-recordings will be automatically uploaded to a secure drive on the cloud. We will inform respondents of our desire to audio-record and ask them for permission. If permission is not granted, we will proceed with the interview using extensive notetaking as our strategy for documenting the interview.

Data Security and Monitoring

JBA has an established firm-wide System Security Plan that assesses all data security measures and monitoring procedures to ensure secure storage and transmittal of information. This plan is updated at least annually.

Interview data and identifying contact information used for recruitment will be stored on a secure OneDrive site. JBA is a subscriber to the FedRAMP ATO-holding Microsoft Online 365 Service with both Business and Enterprise licenses. JBA maintains multiple SharePoint and OneDrive sites to separate data between projects and access requirements within those projects. In addition to operating with Microsoft best practices for security, SharePoint and OneDrive will use the following additional controls that fall within JBA responsibilities for management. Additional documentation pertaining to the security of SharePoint and OneDrive can be found within Microsoft's approved FedRAMP package.

Access Controls

- JBA SharePoint and OneDrive requires users to authenticate using multi-factor authentication for all users.
- JBA SharePoint and OneDrive uses role-based access permissions to limit access to sensitive data and separate access based on assigned roles.
- Only Administrators have access to modify the security policies, sharing permissions or role-based access permissions.

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

- Permissions granted to a user account are based on the principal of least privilege so that users are not afforded access to the system greater than their minimum requirements.
- Passwords used by user and administrative accounts require a minimum of 16 characters and must be complex, meaning that they must contain at least one number, one capital letter, and one symbol.

Remote Access

- JBA only permits users with a valid account access to the JBA managed SharePoint sites. Anonymous or sharing links are prohibited.
- JBA SharePoint Online is hosted on the FedRAMP approved Microsoft Office 365 SharePoint online service. Microsoft controls remote access to the SharePoint Platform. JBA controls user access into the JBA owned and operated sites. Security related to the transmission to and from SharePoint online is documented in the Microsoft FedRAMP package available to the government at <https://www.fedramp.gov>.

A11. Sensitive Information

The information collection does not include sensitive information.

The project team will seek approval from the Colorado Multiple Institution Review Board (COMIRB). JBA will consult with participating tribal agencies to determine whether review by local tribal IRBs is needed. JBA will engage local tribal IRBs after OMB approval is received in order to avoid asking tribal IRBs to re-review study materials if there are changes required by OMB.

A12. Burden

Explanation of Burden Estimates

We plan to engage up to six cases and anticipate interviewing up to seven individuals within each case (a total of 42 interview participants). The interview is expected to take up to 90 minutes.

Table 4. Estimated Annualized Burden and Costs 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 Burden (in hours)	Average Hourly Wage Rate	Total Annual Respondent Cost
INSTRUMENT A: Interview protocol	42	1	1.5	63	\$62.63	\$3,945.69

Estimated Annualized Cost to Respondents

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

Table 4 details the annualized cost to respondent calculations. For all respondents, we are assuming an average hourly wage with benefits of \$62.63 based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) estimates for total compensation for management and professional state and local government workers.³

A13. Costs

Executive Order (EO), Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government (EO 13985) emphasizes consulting with communities that have been historically underserved by Federal policies and programs. The Presidential Memorandum on Restoring Trust in Government through Scientific Integrity and Evidence-Based Policy Making, as well as the ACF Evaluation Policy discuss community engagement and inclusion in research. Consistent with these guidance documents, and to ensure involvement from a variety of people with diverse professional experiences and perspectives in the home visiting field, we plan to offer all participants an honorarium of \$75 for their time spent providing their expertise and experience during the interviews. We expect participants to spend about 90 minutes providing input.

State and tribal agency staff involved in these partnerships hold unique expertise, and their participation is vital to accomplishing the study’s goals. Agencies are not required to participate in the study to meet MIECHV grant requirements and thus respondents are likely to participate in interviews outside of work hours. The honorarium amount was selected because it aligns with the estimated hourly wage for state and local management professionals.

A14. Estimated Annualized Costs to the Federal Government

The total cost for the data collection activities under this current request will be \$405,949. This amount includes all costs related to active engagement; data collection; analysis; and dissemination. See Table 5 for a breakdown of costs.

Table 5. Estimated Annualized Costs to the Federal Government

Cost Category	Estimated Costs
Active Engagement	\$14,031
Data Collection	\$20,162
Analysis	\$40,539
Developing Report of Findings	\$22,462
Total costs over the request period	\$405,949

A15. Reasons for changes in burden

This is for an individual information collection under the umbrella formative generic clearance for program support (0970-0531).

A16. Timeline

³ U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics “National Compensation Survey: Table 3: Employer costs for employee compensation for state and local government workers by occupational and industry group.” 2019. <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/ecec.pdf>.

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

Table 6. Timeline

Task	Time after OMB and IRB approvals
Begin site recruitment	Within 1 week
Data collection	Months 5 through 11 (5 month window)
Data analysis	Months 11 through 15 (5 month window)
Draft report	Months 16 through 21 (6 month window)

A17. Exceptions

No exceptions are necessary for this information collection.

Attachments

INSTRUMENT A: Interview Protocol

APPENDIX A: Draft Recruitment Email and Call Script

APPENDIX B: Draft Study Notification Email from Health Resources and Services Administration

APPENDIX C: MUSE-STC Site Engagement Email

APPENDIX D: MUSE-STC Research Flyer

APPENDIX E: MUSE-STC Consent Form