

Youth and Parent Voices for Research

Formative Data Collections for ACF Research

0970 – 0356

Supporting Statement

Part A

June 2024

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:
Christine Fortunato and Laura Hoard
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 ACF Research (0970-0356).

Description of Request: The *Youth and Parent Voices for Research* Study will conduct focus groups and semi-structured interviews with former Child Welfare System (CWS) involved parents and youth to gather feedback on select measures, recruitment strategies, and other aspects of study design (e.g., burden, administration modes, tokens of appreciation) proposed for potential future data collection(s) for the National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (NSCAW). As such, these activities are intended to inform the design of future NSCAW data collections and are not intended to be generalizable to a broader population.

NSCAW is approved under OMB control number #0970-0202 (Expiration Date: 8/31/2026).

We do not intend for this information to be used as the principal basis for public policy decisions.

Time Sensitivity: In order to remain on schedule with project timelines, we would like to begin recruiting the parent and youth sample and begin data collection as soon as possible.

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

A1. Necessity for Collection

In 2021, the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, established the Preliminary Activities to Support Future Data Collection for the National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (“*Reimagining NSCAW*”) to carry out preliminary activities to guide and inform the development of future NSCAW data collections. NSCAW (OMB #0970-0202) is a nationally representative, longitudinal survey of children and families who came in contact with the child welfare system (CWS). The first cohort of NSCAW began in 1999; there have been three cohorts to date. The goal of the study is to provide information on a range of fundamental questions about the outcomes of children involved with the CWS..

Reimagining NSCAW includes (a) developing potential design option(s); (b) actively engaging with various collaborators and experts; (c) conducting preliminary or pilot data collections; and (d) disseminating findings from these efforts. The *Youth and Parent Voices for Research* information collection is intended to serve as a preliminary data collection that will inform future NSCAW design components.

NSCAW relies on the participation and continued engagement of CWS-involved children, youth, and families to report directly on various aspects of well-being. Therefore, it is important for the project team to gather feedback from potential participants with child welfare system lived experience (CWS LE) on factors that may impact participation in future data collections (e.g., burden, survey administration mode, tokens of appreciation, or whether measures are relevant or appropriate for use with this population). Partnering with individuals who have CWS LE can increase the validity and credibility of research findings and result in more relevant and actionable dissemination products and policy recommendations (Akers et al., 2023; Brewer & Kliever, 2023; Iqbal et al., 2023; DHHS: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, 2022). This information collection supports a stated ACF priority to meaningfully seek and incorporate input from individuals with CWS LE in any potential future NSCAW data collection(s).

No legal or administrative requirements necessitate this information collection. ACF is undertaking the collection at the discretion of the agency.

A2. Purpose

Purpose and Use

The overall purpose of this effort is to contribute to the development of future NSCAW data collections with a goal of improving participation and ultimately data quality. The information collected by the project team will be used to inform the constructs, measures, recruitment, and data collection strategies for future NSCAW data collections by providing information to on:

- Participants’ understanding of certain constructs and measures proposed in one or more of the NSCAW designs developed under *Reimagining NSCAW*; and
- Participants’ perspectives on recruitment strategies and other study design aspects (e.g., administration mode) proposed in one or more of these NSCAW designs.

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

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

- informing the development of ACF research
- maintaining a research agenda that is rigorous and relevant
- ensuring that research products are as current as possible

The information collected as part of this OMB request is meant to contribute to the body of knowledge on ACF programs. It is not intended to be used as the principal basis for a decision by a federal decision-maker and is not expected to meet the threshold of influential or highly influential scientific information.

Guiding Questions

- How do parents and youth (ages 11-17 years old) with CWS LE understand certain constructs and react to specific measures considered for one or more NSCAW design options?
- From the perspective of parents and youth (ages 11-17) with CWS LE, what factors may support continued engagement in a longitudinal data collection effort (e.g., administration mode, tokens of appreciation)?
- From the perspective of parents and youth (ages 11-17) with CWS LE, what factors may support participant's authentic engagement (i.e., feeling comfortable and safe enough to share honest opinions and factual information) when responding to survey items?

Study Design

This one-time data collection will recruit up to 16 parents serving as family mentors¹ and 32 of their eligible children ages 11-17 (12 who are 11-14 years old and 20 who are 15-17 years old) who were involved with the CWS and whose cases are closed. In this study, a "parent" is an individual responsible for the youth prior to any CWS involvement. This can include biological and adoptive parents or kin serving informally as the primary caregiver at that time. In addition, eligible parent participants must have a child aged 11-17 living in the home. To determine eligibility, family mentors will first be asked to complete a screening questionnaire [**Instrument 1**], which will describe the Youth and Parent Voices for Research study, determine eligibility, and include questions intended to ensure adequate representation in focus groups and interviews (e.g., race, ethnicity, LGBTQIA+) (OMB, 2024a; OMB, 2024b).

This study proposes to conduct the following activities, all of which will occur virtually:

1. In-depth semi-structured interviews with 12 youth ages 11-14; (90 minutes each).
 - a. Six interviews will cover Topic Set 1 (**Instrument 2**) and six interviews will cover Topic Set 2 (**Instrument 4**).
2. Two focus groups, each with up to 10 youth ages 15–17; (2 hours each).

¹ Parents will be recruited from family mentor organizations, therefore the term "family mentor" is associated with the parents recruited for this sample.

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

- a. Each youth focus group will focus on different topics (**Instrument 3** and **Instrument 5**). Conducting two youth focus groups is necessary to cover all desired topics within the allotted time for each focus group.
3. Two focus groups, each with up to 8 parents; (2 hours each)
 - a. Both parent focus groups will use the same instrument (**Instrument 6**). Conducting two parent focus groups using the same instrument will allow for smaller group sizes and diverse responses.

These activities will inform the intended use of information collected in the guides that will be used for youth focus groups and semi-structured interviews (**Instruments 2, 3, 4, and 5**) and parent focus groups (**Instrument 6**). These guides prioritize topics directly related to design components proposed in one or more of the NSCAW design options (e.g., constructs, measures, recruitment, and data collection strategies) (**Exhibit 1**). These results are not intended to be representative or generalizable to a given subpopulation.

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

Exhibit 1. Instruments, Data Collection Activities, Respondents, Content, Purpose, and Mode and Duration

<i>Instrument</i>	<i>Data Collection Activities</i>	<i>Respondent, Content, Purpose of Collection</i>	<i>Mode and Duration</i>
<u>Instrument 1:</u> Parent Screener	Screening for study eligibility	Respondents: Parents serving as family mentors who are interested in participating in the Youth and Parent Voices for Research study (N=60) Content: Describe this study, determine eligibility, include additional questions intended to ensure adequate representation in focus groups and interviews, ask for contact information to be used during the study period. Purpose: To determine study eligibility and ensure adequate representation in focus groups and interviews (e.g., race, ethnicity, sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) minorities)	Mode: Online Questionnaire Duration: 5 minutes
<u>Instrument 2:</u> Interview Guide for Youth Ages 11-14 – Topic Set 1	Individual semi-structured interviews (Topic Set 1)	Respondents: Up to 6 youth 11-14 years of age. Content: Perceptions of constructs and measures related to the assessment of well-being, identity ² , systems involvement, and factors that may influence survey response rates (e.g., contact approach, preferences on mode, tokens of appreciation). Purpose: To gather feedback on select measures, recruitment strategies, and other aspects of study design.	Mode: Virtual semi-structured interviews Duration: 1 hour 30 minutes
<u>Instrument 3:</u> Focus Group Guide for Youth Ages 15-17 - Topic Set 1	Focus Group (Topic Set 1)	Respondents: Up to 10 youth 15-17 years of age. Content: Perceptions of constructs and measures related to the assessment of well-being, identity ² , systems involvement, and factors that may influence survey response rates (e.g., contact approach, preferences on mode, tokens of appreciation). Purpose: To gather feedback on select measures, recruitment strategies, and other aspects of study design.	Mode: Virtual focus group Duration: 2 hours
<u>Instrument 4:</u> Interview Guide for Youth Ages 11-14 – Topic Set 2	Individual semi-structured interviews (Topic Set 2)	Respondents: Up to 6 youth 11-14 years of age. Content: Perceptions of constructs and measures related to happiness, belongingness, resilience, substance use, bullying, prescription drug use, social support, and factors that may enhance youth comfort levels with answering questions honestly. Purpose: To gather feedback on select measures, recruitment strategies, and other aspects of study design.	Mode: Virtual semi-structured interviews Duration: 1 hour 30 minutes
<u>Instrument 5:</u> Focus Group Guide for Youth Ages 15-17 - Topic Set 2	Focus Group (Topic Set 2)	Respondents: Up to 10 youth 15-17 years of age. Content: Perceptions of constructs and measures related to happiness, belongingness, resilience, substance use, bullying, prescription drug use, social support, and factors that may enhance youth comfort levels with answering questions honestly. Purpose: To gather feedback on select measures, recruitment strategies, and other aspects of study design.	Mode: Virtual focus group Duration: 2-hours

² Including race and ethnicity and SOGI.

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

<p><u>Instrument 6:</u></p> <p>Focus Group Guide for Parents</p>	<p>Focus Groups</p>	<p>Respondents: Up to 8 parents in each of the two focus groups, for a total of up to 16. Content: Perceptions of constructs (i.e., child welfare experiences, social support, intimate partner violence) and measures related to the assessment of economic strain, positive parenting, and substance use. Parents will also be asked questions about factors that may influence survey response rates (e.g., preferences on mode, tokens of appreciation). Purpose: To gather feedback on select measures, recruitment strategies, and other aspects of study design.</p>	<p>Mode: Virtual focus groups</p> <p>Duration: 2-hours each</p>
---	---------------------	--	---

Additional detail on study design, sampling, and data collection procedures are found in **Supporting Statement B**.

Other Data Sources and Uses of Information

No other data sources will be used.

A3. Use of Information Technology to Reduce Burden

Participants will be screened for eligibility and provide written consent using Blaise 5, a secure web platform for building and managing online databases and surveys. Completing the screening and consent process online is expected to be more efficient and less burdensome for the parent participant. In addition, interviews and focus groups will be conducted virtually (online) so that participants do not have to travel to participate. The project team will also offer support over the telephone if the participant has any questions with the screener or consent.

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

A literature review and environmental scan were completed by the project team to identify existing data, reduce duplication of effort, and as a result, minimize participation burden. No existing sources were found with information relevant to the data collection effort described here.

A5. Impact on Small Businesses

This effort will not involve small businesses.

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

A technical workgroup (TWG) comprised of fewer than nine research experts and individuals with CWS LE was formed as part of preliminary data collection activities under *Reimagining NSCAW* which informed the objectives, goals, and design of the Youth and Parent Voices for Research study. The project team worked with the TWG to gather input and recommendations around which priority constructs and measures should be presented to and discussed with these participants, particularly around the use of potentially problematic terminology in proposed measures (e.g., outdated, not inclusive, triggering). In addition, the TWG recommended gathering participant input on the possibility for revising established measures and including additional constructs (**Instruments 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6**).

The TWG also made recommendations for the study design, including sample composition, recruitment and engagement strategies that prioritized participant comfort and safety, and data collection mode (e.g., online, in-person). For example, they recommended that the Parent Screener (**Instrument 1**) include items about potential parent participants' race, ethnicity, and SOG [including that of their eligible child], so that sample selection could prioritize and reflect the composition of families involved with the CWS.

With regards to data collection strategies, the TWG recommended a mix of semi-structured interviews with youth ages 11-14, focus groups with youth ages 15-17, and focus groups with parents. The younger youth group (ages 11-14) will be individually interviewed as opposed to being a part of a focus group due to recommendations from the RTI Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the TWG. Youth ages 11-14 may not fully understand how limits of confidentiality apply to other group members or that their words may be quoted in reports (which is part of the focus group consent and agreement to participate [**Appendix C**]). As such, individual interviews with these youth will allow for a more flexible and private space to help ensure they understand study protocols and constraints.

A9. Tokens of Appreciation

Each participant (parent and youth) will receive an electronic gift card token of appreciation for completing the focus group or interview. Parents and youth ages 15-17 will receive a \$50 gift card and youth ages 11-14 will receive a \$40 gift card.

Monetary tokens of appreciation offered to parent participants (i.e., \$50 gift card) are intended to offset any incidental costs associated with their participation, e.g., childcare, that may otherwise prevent their participation in the study. This will also help mitigate non-response bias by increasing the likelihood that individuals with constraints on their time may be more likely to participate. The parent tokens of appreciation are consistent with other ACF-sponsored projects involving families in the CWS, including **NSCAW III** (OMB: 0970-0202) in which young adults received \$50 to participate at follow up; and the **Survey of Youth Transitioning from Foster Care** (OMB: 0970-0546), in which young adults who were recently, or are currently in, foster care received \$75 for a 60-minute telephone/web survey.

Monetary tokens of appreciation offered to youth participants (i.e., \$50 electronic gift card for youth 15-17 and \$40 electronic gift card for youth 11-14) are intended to minimize non-response bias by increasing the likelihood of recruiting a diverse sample to participate in the focus groups or the interviews, e.g., racial/ethnic minorities across socio-economic status. The monetary token of appreciation offered to youth respondents is consistent with other ACF-sponsored projects involving youth in the CWS, including **NSCAW III** (OMB: 0970-0202), in which youth 11 years of age and older received a \$20 gift card and a nonmonetary token of appreciation (e.g., ear buds) of approximately equal value. The non-monetary token of appreciation was added to the NSCAW III protocol during data collection after several mitigation strategies (e.g., creation of a new youth fact sheet, assigning cases to more experienced data collectors) failed to address lower-than-expected production and observable non-response bias among this age group. This experience suggests a token of appreciation will help to address potential data quality issues. Additionally, since the Youth and Parent Voices for Research Study involves requests for more time from participants (as compared to the examples noted above), participating youth will receive a larger monetary token of appreciation to effectively engage this group.

Tokens of appreciation are used to encourage participation and convey appreciation for respondent contributions to the research. The use of tokens of appreciation can significantly increase participation rates and reduce nonresponse (e.g., Singer 2002; Singer and Ye, 2013). This is true not only for adults, but also children. For example, Martinson et al. (2000) found that the inclusion of tokens of appreciation increased participation rates among adolescents from 55% to 69%. However, Rice and Broome (2004) note the importance of ensuring that the tokens of appreciation provided are appropriate for the child's developmental level and recommended that gift vouchers or other redeemable tokens of appreciation be used instead of cash.

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

Personally Identifiable Information

The following Personally Identifiable Information (PII) will be collected: child sexual orientation, child gender identity, child name, child age, as well as parent name, email address, and phone number (**Instrument 1**). This information will be used for sample selection purposes (to ensure a diverse sample) and for contacting purposes during the study period (e.g., to schedule the focus group or interview and send reminders) and will not be used for analytic purposes. No PII will be stored with the focus group or interview data except for child's gender and age. PII used for contacting purposes will be kept separately from any information collected during interviews and focus groups, and will be linked by Participant ID.

Information will not be maintained in an electronic system from which data are actually or directly retrieved by an individual's personal identifier.

Assurances of Privacy

Participants will be informed of all planned uses of de-identified study data (which may be during the study period or beyond), that their participation is voluntary, and that their information

will be kept private to the extent permitted by law. They will be notified that PII will not be retained or shared beyond its use for contacting purposes during this study. As part of the written consent/agreement to participate process (**Appendix C**), participants will be asked to consent to being audio-recorded for data quality and coding purposes. As specified in the contract, the Contractor (RTI) will comply with all Federal and Departmental regulations for adequately securing and protecting private information.

In addition, RTI obtained a federal Certificate of Confidentiality for this study. This certificate prevents the release of information that would identify you with anyone, even from a court order.

Data Security and Monitoring

The project team will ensure that all staff, including all subcontractors, who perform work under this contract are trained on data privacy issues and comply with the above requirements. The data collected through this information request will not be shared outside of the federal and contractor staff directly involved with the project. All RTI staff are required to participate in annual data security awareness training.

RTI complies with the originally passed E-Government Act of 2002 and the amended Federal Information Security Modernization Act (FISMA) of 2014, which covers site security, security control documentation, access control, change management, incident response, and risk management. RTI/Global Technology Solutions (GTS) is an ISO/IEC 27001:2013 certified provider whose Information Security Management System (ISMS) has received third-party accreditation from the International Standards Organization. Additionally, GTS has received an Authority to Operate under the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) SP 800-53r4 for FIPS LOW and FIPS MOD classifications assessed by an accredited FedRAMP Third Party Assessment Organizations (3PAO). In accordance with these frameworks, RTI has implemented continuous monitoring capabilities to ensure that all security controls are regularly monitored and reported on. These monitoring capabilities include but are not limited to regular vulnerability scanning, automated audit log monitoring, intrusion detection and prevention measures, data loss prevention measures, and periodic control auditing.

Systems for this project will operate in both the FIPS Moderate and FIPS Low networks, with only deidentified data residing in the FIPS Low network. Access to RTI networks, systems, and databases is strictly controlled by role-based security in the form of Windows security groups. An individual's security group membership is determined based on the minimum necessary access to perform their job function on the project, and need-to-know. Staff are only added to security groups after completing the project confidentiality pledge and any required trainings on data security. Addition to or removal from security groups is strictly controlled and audited, accomplished via a formal request to GTS which must be approved by the project director or authorized designate. Security group membership is audited quarterly by project leaders to ensure that only those who still need specified access continue group membership.

A11. Sensitive Information³

The Parent Screener (**Instrument 1**) requests information from the parent on the child's sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI). As explained to the parent at the start of the screener, these questions are optional and for sample selection purposes only, to ensure diversity across participants to the extent possible, given the small sample size. Additionally, focus groups and interviews (**Instruments 2, 3, 4, and 5**) will request feedback on potentially sensitive topics, including SOGI. However, this study is not asking the focus group or interview participants to share their own individual responses to these questions, rather, they are being asked to provide feedback on how the questions and response options are worded, how they are perceived, or how they may be perceived by other youth their age.

A12. Burden

Explanation of Burden Estimates

This one-time data collection will recruit up to 16 parents and 32 of their eligible children ages 11-17 to participate in focus groups or interviews intended to inform future NSCAW data collections.

The efforts will begin by screening parents for eligibility and willingness to participate. We estimate that approximately 60 family mentors will be screened to have a sample of 16 parents who are eligible and willing to participate as well as 32 of their eligible children ages 11-17. Participation in the data collection activities will take approximately 2 hours for focus groups (parents and youth 15-17 years of age) and approximately 1 hour and 30 minutes for semi-structured interviews (youth 11-14 years of age).

Estimated burden was calculated by totaling the estimated time for the parent screener (**Instrument 1**) and the proposed activities that follow, during which the parents and youth will be asked to provide feedback on the constructs, measures, and other survey administration questions included in each instrument (**Instruments 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6**).

Parent burden was calculated using the mean salary for full-time employees over the age of 25 who are high school graduates with no college experience (\$22.63/hour)⁴.

Estimated Annualized Cost to Respondents

The total annual respondent burden for the information collection effort covered by this clearance request is 90.6 hours for a total annual respondent cost of \$738. This is an estimate

³ 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.

⁴ Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, The Economics Daily, Median weekly earnings \$721 for workers without high school diploma, \$1,864 for advanced degree at <https://www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2023/median-weekly-earnings-721-for-workers-without-high-school-diploma-1864-for-advanced-degree.htm> (visited March 09, 2024).

based on the assumption that approximately 60 family mentors will be screened to have a sample of 16 parents who are eligible and willing to participate as well as 32 of their eligible children ages 11-17. **Exhibit 2** presents the estimated number of respondents, time burden per respondent, and estimated cost burden to respondents, by instrument.

Exhibit 2: Burden Estimates by Instrument

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
Instrument 1 - Parent Screener	60	1	.08	5	\$22.63	\$114
Instrument 2 – Interview Guide for Youth Ages 11-14 – Topic Set 1	6	1	1.5	9	\$0	\$0
Instrument 3 – Focus Group Guide for Youth Ages 15-17 – Topic Set 1	10	1	2.0	20	\$0	\$0
Instrument 4 – Interview Guide for Youth Ages 11-14 – Topic Set 2	6	1	1.5	9	\$0	\$0
Instrument 5 – Focus Group Guide for Youth Ages 15-17 – Topic Set 2	10	1	2.0	20	\$0	\$0
Instrument 6 – Focus Group Guide for Parents	16	1	2.0	32	\$22.63	\$724
Total	92			95		\$738

A13. Costs

There are no additional costs to respondents.

A14. Estimated Annualized Costs to the Federal Government

The exhibit below presents estimated annualized costs to the federal government directly related to the information collection, which would not have been incurred otherwise.

Exhibit 3: Estimated Annualized Costs to the Federal Government

Activity	Detail	Estimated Cost
Instrument and Materials Finalization; IRB Clearance; User testing (Instrument 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FTE time Operational expenses (e.g., REV.com license) IRB clearance 	\$50,000
Survey administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FTE time Operational expenses (e.g., tokens of appreciation) 	\$70,000
Analysis and initial dissemination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FTE time 	\$50,000
Total/annual costs over the request period		\$170,000

A15. Reasons for changes in burden

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

A16. Timeline

Our timeline is displayed in the exhibit below, and is contingent on the timing of OMB approval:

Exhibit 4: Timeline for Information Collection

Activity	Timeline	Duration
Finalization of Instruments and Materials; IRB Clearance	Begin upon OMB approval	1 month
Information Collection	Begin 1 month after OMB approval	3 months
Data cleaning and analysis, preparation of dissemination product (e.g., brief)	Begin 4 months after OMB approval	1 month
Total		5 months

A17. Exceptions

No exceptions are necessary for this information collection.

Attachments

Instruments

Instrument 1 – Parent Screener

Instrument 2 – Interview Guide for Youth Ages 11-14 – Topic Set 1

Instrument 3 – Focus Group Guide for Youth Ages 15-17 – Topic Set 1

Instrument 4 – Interview Guide for Youth Ages 11-14 – Topic Set 2

Instrument 5 – Focus Group Guide for Youth Ages 15-17 – Topic Set 2

Instrument 6 – Focus Group Guide for Parents

Appendices

Appendix A: Outreach to Family Mentor Organization(s)

Appendix B: Outreach Materials for Family Mentors

Appendix C: Consent, Permission, Agreement to Participate Forms

References

- Akers, L., Tippins, J., Hauan, S., and Lynch-Smith, M. (2023). *Advancing Primary Prevention in Human Services: Opportunities for People with Lived Experience (Issue Brief)*. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services: Washington, D.C.
- Brewer, J., & Kliewer, B. (2023). Front Porch Conversations: Methodological Innovations to Participatory Action Research & Asset-Based Community Development. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research & Engagement*, 61(2), 1–16. <https://doi-org.proxy.uchicago.edu/10.5130/ijcre.v16i2.8670>.
- Charlton, J. I. (1998). *Nothing about us without us*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. doi: 10.1525/9780520925441.
- Iqbal, H., West, J., McEachan, R. R. C., & Haith-Cooper, M. (2023). Reflections from an insider researcher 'doing' feminist participatory action research to co-produce a research agenda with British Pakistani women; a seldom heard group. *Action Research*, 21(4), 456–471. <https://doi-org.proxy.uchicago.edu/10.1177/14767503231191854>
- Kidd, S., Davidson, L., Frederick, T., and Kral, M. J. (2018). Reflecting on participatory, action-oriented research methods in community psychology: Progress, problems, and paths forward. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 61, 76–87. doi: 10.1002/ajcp.12214.
- Martinson, B. C., Lazovich, D., Lando, H. A., Perry, C. L., McGovern, P. G., & Boyle, R. G. (2000). Effectiveness of monetary incentives for recruiting adolescents to an intervention trial to reduce smoking. *Preventive Medicine*, 31(6), 706-713. [https://doi.org/10.1006/pmed.2000.0762\[1\]](https://doi.org/10.1006/pmed.2000.0762[1])
- Office of Management and Budget (OMB) (2024a): Recommendations on the best practices for the collection of sexual orientation and gender identity data on federal statistical surveys, Information Collection Request, 2024.
- Office of Management and Budget (OMB) (2024b): Revisions to OMB's Statistical Policy Directive No. 15: Standards for Maintaining, Collecting, and Presenting Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity, 89 FR 22182 (Mar 28, 2024), Available at: <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/03/29/2024-06469/revisions-to-ombs-statistical-policy-directive-no-15-standards-for-maintaining-collecting-and>
- Rice, M., & Broome, M. E. (2004). Incentives for children in research. *Journal of nursing scholarship : an official publication of Sigma Theta Tau International Honor Society of Nursing*, 36(2), 167–172. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1547-5069.2004.04030.x>
- Singer, E. (2002). The use of incentives to reduce nonresponse in household surveys. In Groves, R.B., Dillman, D.A., Eltinge, J.L., & Little, R.J.A (Eds), *Survey Nonresponse*. New York: Wiley.
- Singer, E., & Ye, C. (2013). The use and effects of incentives in surveys. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 645, 112-141.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. (2022). *What is Lived Experience?* by Grace Guerrero Ramirez, Kate Bradley, Lauren Amos, Dana Jean-Baptiste, Ryan Ruggiero, Yvonne Marki, Jeremiah Donier, Helena Girouard, Danny Murillo, Laura Erickson, and Amanda Benton. Washington, District of Columbia. Accessed at: <https://aspe.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/5840f2f3645ae485c268a2784e1132c5/What-Is-Lived-Experience.pdf>.

