

- SUPPORTING STATEMENT - PART A

On-Site Installation Evaluations – OMB 0704-0610

Summary of Changes from Previously Approved Collection

- There has been both an increase and decrease in burden for this collection. The burden has increased due to the amount of time for the focus group, increasing from an hour to an hour and fifteen minutes per session. The burden has decreased for the "Competency Assessment for Sexual Assault Prevention Practitioners (CASAPP)" collection instrument due to the introduction of the Leadership and Prevention surveys.
- There are wording changes that have been added to the discussion protocols to clarify concepts to be more easily understood by respondents. Concepts and intent of the questions remain the same. There have also been changes to content to better tailor to specific audiences.

1. Need for the Information Collection

These information collections continue to support a high-visibility requirement codified in the Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 6400.11, Integrated Primary Prevention Policy for Prevention Workforce and Leaders. Section 5.2 directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R)) to conduct On-Site Installation Evaluations (OSIEs) every other year in accordance with the March 30, 2022 Secretary of Defense Memorandum.

These information collections, conducted at on-site visits at high risk and promising installations, are in support of Secretary of Defense directed actions, which are now codified in DoDI 6400.11. The initial authorization provided the opportunity to conduct information collections from 20 installations from June 2021-January 2022. The purpose of the site visits was to determine, using standardized metrics, if selected installations' prevention capabilities were ready and able to address risk for interpersonal and self-directed violence at the unit and installation levels. Where site visits determined that the installations' prevention capabilities were ready and able, the evaluations highlighted actions that could be replicated elsewhere, and where the installations' prevention capabilities were not ready and able, results enabled the Office of Force Resiliency (OFR) to recommend concrete actions to strengthen prevention activities that reduce risk and enhance protective factors.

The initial 20 sites served as a pilot for standardized metrics and methods developed for On-Site Installation Evaluations (OSIEs). As of December 2024, 74 On-site Installation Evaluations (OSIEs) have been completed around the world (reports found at www.prevention.mil). In 2025, biennial information collections will continue to evaluate 15 DoD installations each year where the military community is at increased or decreased risk for harmful behaviors based on the revised methods and metrics refined through the initial two rounds of OSIE visits. Effective prevention decreases risk factors and increases protective factors. OSIEs will answer: Are the installation's prevention capabilities poised

to address the risk detected on the command climate assessment? If so, what is going right that could be replicated elsewhere? If not, what concrete actions could be taken to improve the installation's ability to address risk and enhance promise?

A report based on the first wave of OSIEs was submitted to the Secretary of Defense in October 2021 (with an addendum of updated results submitted in early 2022). The pilot and enduring evaluation assessed the implementation of DoD Instruction 6400.09, "DoD Policy on Integrated Primary Prevention of Self-Directed Harm and Prohibited Abuse or Harm," September 11, 2020.

The Office of Force Resiliency (OFR) initially identified 20 DoD installations of risk and promise to take part in the pilot assessment. Sites were identified based on analysis of their 2021 command climate assessments. Sites with outlier scores, on both positive and negative ends, were selected for site visits. Methods for the selection of participating sites follow a similar identification process as in the pilot (using a more robust assessment of risk and promise), and the evolving nature of these analyses is captured in the OSIE reports published on prevention.mil. Continued iterations of these methods will be used for site selection for the renewal period.

At each site, in addition to assessing installation assets (e.g., prevention personnel that provide services to the entire installation), data will be collected from the 1-3 units that drive the installation's risk and promise score. There will be three data sources: 1) responding to a "request for information"; 2) participating in discussions during the site visit; and 3) completing a survey. The discussions and surveys constitute the information collections covered in this request.

2. Use of the Information

The respondents will be a cross section of personnel at the selected installations that fall into two general categories. First, are personnel that are specific to prevention and intervention activities relating to a variety of negative behaviors (e.g., alcohol use, suicide, sexual harassment). These include: Integrated Primary Prevention Workforce (IPPW), Sexual assault response coordinators, victim advocates, Family Advocacy Program staff, MEO/EEO staff, Mental Health Professionals, Enlisted medical personnel (e.g., medics, corpsmen), Inspectors general and misdemeanor and felony-level law enforcement representatives, Chaplains, MWR and community/ support services staff, total force fitness practitioners, and physical health professionals. We are collecting data from these individuals because they have first-hand knowledge of how prevention activities are executed at the installation. In most cases, given the size of the identified sites, samples of participants will represent a census of the personnel at these locations.

The second category are general personnel that will be important to talk to for their perceptions of how prevention is prioritized and experienced at the installation and will include (the target sample is in parentheses): Installation commander/Senior Mission commander and command leadership team (12), E1-E4 Men (12), E1-E4 Women (12), O1-O3 Men (12), O1-O3 Women (12), E5-E6 Men (12), E5-E6 Women (12), O4-O5 Men (12),

O4-O5 Women (12), E7-E9 Men (12), E7-E9 Women (12). These individuals will be selected from the specific units that drive command climate risk or promise at the site. We will use personnel data to determine how representative these respondents are of the total base population. Additionally, family members of these Service members will be invited to focus groups to better understand the impact of the mission on the Service member and their support systems.

Respondents' participation in these information collections is voluntary.

There will be three data sources: 1) responding to a "request for information"; 2) participating in discussions during the site visit; and 3) completing a survey. Data source 1 and 2 will be the same questions. The request for information will be sent ahead via an emailed Word document to a point of contact (POC) at each installation. The POC will arrange to have the relevant individual(s) answer the questions in the Word document and send back by email to the government representative leading the OSIE team. In our experience, these types of requests for information are often returned incomplete, unclear, or inaccurate. Thus, at the site visits, site visit staff will follow up to confirm the information and fill in any missing data. During the site visit, various groups of individuals specified above will be organized into a series of discussion groups in one to one and a half hour slots. The questions for 1 and 2 will be open-ended questions about the prevention activities. The discussions will NOT be recorded, but a note taker will be part of the site visit team and will take detailed notes. Those notes will be uploaded to Qualtrics via a secure platform for the agency to organize and used for analysis. Data source 3 will be a survey of individual competencies to carry out prevention activities. Individuals will complete the survey at their respective discussion group slot during the site visit. The survey will be administered via Qualtrics or paper and pencil and collected by site visit staff who will hand carry the completed paper forms back to the agency for data entry and analysis; all electronic copies will be uploaded to Qualtrics. Data management and Qualtrics maintenance is provided by the OSIE research organization.

The end result of the data collection will be a series of ratings for each installation to characterize the maturity of prevention at each installation (e.g., how consistently prevention is prioritized, how consistently people are prepared to conduct needed prevention, and how consistently prevention is done well). The ratings will be on a 1-5 scale (1 = rarely or never, 5 = consistently). There will be 9 ratings for each installation. The 9 ratings derive from 3 infrastructure elements being applied to four content domains (see Table 1). A detailed description of the metrics development, validation, and scoring will be found in the RAND Research Report, *Novel Methods to Assess the Military's Evolving Prevention Capability*. The information collection tools can be found in the *Leadership and Prevention Surveys*. The manuscript, *Development and Pilot Test of the Competency Assessment for Sexual Assault Prevention Practitioners*, details the development and validation of the surveys. A description of how and why the information collection tools were adapted can be found in the *Metric and Survey Development* document.

Table 1. Rating domains for each installation

	PRIORITY	PREPARATION	IMPLEMENTATION
	1	2	3
PROTECTIVE ENVIRONMENT	Leaders demonstrate priority for fostering a protective environment by their actions (e.g., role modeling, taking timely action to address negative behaviors and reinforce positive ones) and communications.	Leaders need to have the requisite knowledge, skills, abilities (KSAs) and access to training to develop those KSAs. Structures and processes need to be in place that support a protective environment (e.g., appropriate socialization opportunities; providing leaders' professional feedback and support for difficult tasks).	Leaders employ practices known to support a protective environment (e.g., model appropriate behavior, encourage appropriate socialization, refer service members to resources when needed, encourage open and respectful communication). Multiple actions are taken to ensure that these practices are done well, including setting expectations and clearly delineating roles and responsibilities; ensuring subordinates have appropriate workloads and are rewarded for high performance; all service members are held responsible for negative behaviors with either appropriate sanctions (e.g., sexual assault) or resources (e.g., substance abuse, suicidal ideation).
INTEGRATED PRIMARY PREVENTION	Leaders make conducting prevention activities a priority and hold subordinates accountable for its completion.	Leaders provide prevention personnel the resources they need to conduct prevention. Leaders and prevention personnel have the knowledge and skills they need the carry out prevention successfully.	Prevention activities are carried out and evaluated that target risk and protective factors that cut across multiple negative behaviors.
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT	Leaders convey that engaging stakeholder involvement is a priority and hold subordinates accountable for doing so.	Prevention personnel have the resources, knowledge, and skills to engage stakeholders effectively.	Stakeholders are regularly and genuinely engaged in prevention activities across multiple stages (i.e., problem conceptualization, prevention activity implementation, evaluation).

3. Use of Information Technology

This data will be collected during in-person site visits as much as possible. In rare circumstances (e.g., when a key stakeholder is on leave during the site visit), a follow-up phone call may be used.

4. Non-duplication

The pre-visit request for information will obtain all existing information in support of the evaluations, such that the data collected on site will be unique and not duplicate existing information collections.

The information obtained through this collection is unique and is not already available for use or adaptation from another cleared source.

5. Burden on Small Businesses

This information collection does not impose a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small businesses or entities.

6. Less Frequent Collection

On-site information collection will take place at 15-20 installations identified as high and low risk on a biennial basis. Different installations will likely be selected for each evaluation cycle, which will minimize burden of these information collections on the locations and respondents.

7. Paperwork Reduction Act Guidelines

This collection of information does not require collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with the guidelines delineated in 5 CFR 1320.5(d)(2).

8. Consultation and Public Comments

Part A: PUBLIC NOTICE

A 60-Day Federal Register Notice (FRN) for the collection published on (Tuesday, November 11, 2024). The 60-Day FRN citation is 89 FRN 91372.

No comments were received during the 60-Day Comment Period.

A 30-Day Federal Register Notice for the collection published on Friday, January 10, 2025. The 30-Day FRN citation is 90 FR 1986.

Part B: CONSULTATION

DoD contracted with the Miami University of Ohio to support the development of the methods and metrics for the OSIEs and to collect and analyze data. Given the personnel and manpower hours necessary to support the number of engagements scheduled for each biennial site visit and the amount of data analysis to be completed after each visit, DoD will continue to contract with a third party, Booz Allen Hamilton, to ensure the rigor of all products.

9. Gifts or Payment

No payments or gifts are being offered to respondents as an incentive to participate in the collection.

10. Confidentiality

A statement of confidentiality and limits of confidentiality (e.g., self/other harm) will be included in the survey as well as in the introduction of the discussions.

A Privacy Act Statement is not required for this collection because we are not requesting individuals to furnish personal information for a system of records.

A System of Record Notice (SORN) is not required for this collection because records are not retrievable by PII.

A Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) is not required for this collection because PII is not being collected electronically.

Any files collected by Booz Allen Hamilton will be securely transferred to OFR using the secure system of OFR's choice.

Cut off upon completion of research project. Destroy 30 years after cutoff IAW 1803-11 (DAA-0330-2021-0008-0001).

11. Sensitive Questions

No questions considered sensitive are being asked in this collection.

12. Respondent Burden and its Labor Costs

Part A: ESTIMATION OF RESPONDENT BURDEN

1) Collection Instrument(s)

[On-site Interview Questions]

- a) Number of Respondents: 3000
- b) Number of Responses Per Respondent: 1
- c) Number of Total Annual Responses: 3000
- d) Response Time: 1 hour and 15 fifteen minutes
- e) Respondent Burden Hours: 3750 hours

[Leader Survey]

- a) Number of Respondents: 1400
- b) Number of Responses Per Respondent: 1
- c) Number of Total Annual Responses: 1400
- d) Response Time: 10 minutes
- e) Respondent Burden Hours: 233 hours

[Prevention Survey]

- a) Number of Respondents: 600
- b) Number of Responses Per Respondent: 1
- c) Number of Total Annual Responses: 600

- d) Response Time: 10 minutes
 - e) Respondent Burden Hours: 100 hours
- 2) Total Submission Burden (Summation or average based on collection)
- a) Total Number of Respondents: 5000
 - b) Total Number of Annual Responses: 5000
 - c) Total Respondent Burden Hours: 4,083 hours

Part B: LABOR COST OF RESPONDENT BURDEN

- 1) Collection Instrument(s)
- [On-site Interview Questions]
- a) Number of Total Annual Responses: 3000
 - b) Response Time: 1 hour and 15 minutes
 - c) Respondent Hourly Wage: \$28.22
 - d) Labor Burden per Response: \$ 35.28
 - e) Total Labor Burden: \$ 105,840

- [Leader Survey]
- a) Number of Total Annual Responses: 1400
 - b) Response Time: 10 minutes
 - c) Respondent Hourly Wage: \$28.22
 - d) Labor Burden per Response: \$2.82
 - e) Total Labor Burden: \$3948

- [Prevention Survey]
- a) Number of Total Annual Responses: 600
 - b) Response Time: 10 minutes
 - c) Respondent Hourly Wage: \$28.22
 - d) Labor Burden per Response: \$2.82
 - e) Total Labor Burden: \$1,692

An average DoD hourly wage was calculated from payscale.com, a compensation aggregation web service.

- 2) Overall Labor Burden
- a) Total Number of Annual Responses: 5000
 - b) Total Labor Burden: \$111,480

The Respondent hourly wage was determined by using the [Department of Labor Wage Website] (<http://www.dol.gov/dol/topic/wages/index.htm>)

13. Respondent Costs Other Than Burden Hour Costs

There are no annualized costs to respondents other than the labor burden costs addressed in Section 12 of this document to complete this collection.

14. Cost to the Federal Government

Part A: LABOR COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Please note, Miami University through their IPA (\$284,334) with OFR will assume the burden for data processing of the three instruments.

- 1) Collection Instrument(s)
[On-site Interview Questions]
 - a) Number of Total Annual Responses: 3000
 - b) Processing Time per Response: 0 hours
 - c) Hourly Wage of Worker(s) Processing Responses: \$0
 - d) Cost to Process Each Response: \$0
 - e) Total Cost to Process Responses: \$0

- 2) Collection Instrument(s) [Leader Survey]
 - f) Number of Total Annual Responses: 1400
 - g) Processing Time per Response: 0 hours
 - h) Hourly Wage of Worker(s) Processing Responses: \$0
 - i) Cost to Process Each Response: \$0
 - j) Total Cost to Process Responses: \$0

- 3) Collection Instrument(s) [Prevention Survey]
 - k) Number of Total Annual Responses: 600
 - l) Processing Time per Response: 0 hours
 - m) Hourly Wage of Worker(s) Processing Responses: \$0
 - n) Cost to Process Each Response: \$0
 - o) Total Cost to Process Responses: \$0

- 4) Overall Labor Burden to the Federal Government
 - a) Total Number of Annual Responses: 5000
 - b) Total Labor Burden: \$0

Part B: OPERATIONAL AND MAINTENANCE COSTS

Please note, Booze, Allen, Hamilton through their contract (\$1,419,258) with OFR will assume the burden for operational and maintenance costs of the three instruments.

- 1) Cost Categories
 - a) Equipment: \$0
 - b) Printing: \$0
 - c) Postage: \$0
 - d) Software Purchases: \$0
 - e) Licensing Costs: \$0
 - f) Other: \$0

- 2) Total Operational and Maintenance Cost: \$1,419,258

Part C: TOTAL COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

- 1) Total Labor Cost to the Federal Government: \$284,334
- 2) Total Operational and Maintenance Costs: \$1,419,258
- 3) Total Cost to the Federal Government: \$1,703,592

15. Reasons for Change in Burden

There has been both an increase and decrease in burden for this collection. The burden has increased due to the amount of time for the focus group, increasing from an hour to an hour and fifteen minutes per session. The burden has decreased for the "Competency Assessment for Sexual Assault Prevention Practitioners (CASAPP)" collection instrument due to the introduction of the Leadership and Prevention surveys.

16. Publication of Results

The results of this information collection will be provided as a report to the Secretary of Defense (copy provided for OMB review) and will not be published outside of DoD unless directed by the Secretary.

17. Non-Display of OMB Expiration Date

We are not seeking approval to omit the display of the expiration date of the OMB approval on the collection instrument.

18. Exceptions to "Certification for Paperwork Reduction Submissions"

We are not requesting any exemptions to the provisions stated in 5 CFR 1320.9.