

Sexual Risk Avoidance Education (SRAE) National Evaluation Impact and Implementation Study

OMB Information Collection Request New Request

Supporting Statement Part B

MARCH 2026

Type of Request: New

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:
Calonie Gray
Tia Brown

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

Part B

B1. Objectives

Study Objectives

The data collected under this information collection request is intended to build evidence about innovative implementation strategies that have the potential to improve programming and outcomes across Sexual Risk Avoidance Education (SRAE) grant recipients and the youth they serve. In particular, this study will conduct an impact and implementation evaluation of the delivery of a SRAE program that is part of a 2-week summer program offered in community sites. The summer program focuses on youth employment and the SRAE and comparison programs (the focus for the impact and implementation evaluation) are delivered within the broader employment program. The information gathered from this evaluation will explore whether implementing the curriculum is an effective way to deliver SRAE programming. Through the implementation evaluation, the study will gather information on the context of program delivery and better understand and interpret the impact evaluation findings.

Generalizability of Results

Impact Evaluation

Information collected through the Youth Survey (Instrument 1) is intended to produce estimates of the impact of program services in the sites. The randomized study is intended to produce internally-valid estimates of the intervention's causal impact, not to promote statistical generalization to other sites or service populations.

Implementation Evaluation

The information collected through implementation study instruments (Instruments 2-3) is intended to present an internally valid description of the youth and the implementation of a strategy in the sites. Information collected through the implementation evaluation is not intended to promote statistical generalization to other sites or service populations.

Appropriateness of Study Design and Methods for Planned Uses

Impact Evaluation

The study team has identified the promising SRAE program that is ready for evaluation. The evaluation will use an individual-level randomized controlled trial design to assess the impact of the SRAE program on youth outcomes. Youth with consent will be randomly assigned to either receive the SRAE program or a comparison group program. Random assignment will be stratified by sex and age. Siblings, or youth raised as siblings who reside in the same home, will be randomized together as mini-clusters. This design is appropriate to assess program outcomes as it ensures assignment to group is based on random chance, rather than the decisions of program or site staff. Potential limitations to the design include attrition and limited statistical power. The study team has established a target of enrolling 500 youth to ensure sufficient statistical power and has processes in place to obtain high response rates at all data collection time points. Should the study have high attrition, the pre-program survey collects baseline information that would allow us to assess equivalence of the groups to ensure the analysis could still present internally valid impact results.

Implementation Evaluation

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

The implementation evaluation will assess the implementation of the SRAE program and a comparison program. It will capture information through interviews with program staff, including program facilitators, grant recipient program staff, and partner implementation site staff; and youth focus groups. This information is appropriate because it will support interpretation of impact evaluation findings and describe the implementation of the program, in terms of youth attendance, program fidelity, youth engagement and rapport with facilitators, and fit of the program to the implementation setting.

As noted in Supporting Statement A, information from the impact and implementation evaluations is not intended to be used as the principal basis for public policy decisions by federal staff and is not expected to meet the threshold of influential or highly influential scientific information. Resulting publications will provide high-quality information on whether the SRAE program shows evidence of effectiveness. All dissemination efforts will clearly outline the limitations of the study.

B2. Methods and Design

Target Population

The study will take place with youth participating in the SRAE program. This study will take place at up to nine community sites.

Impact Evaluation

The impact evaluation focuses on youth enrolled in the SRAE program. The majority of participants will be high school aged youth, but the program may serve youth from 13-24 years. This is the target population for **Instrument 1 Youth Survey**. The study team expects to enroll up to 500 youth into the impact evaluation.

Implementation Evaluation

The target populations for each implementation evaluation instrument are:

- **Instrument 2 Staff interview protocol:** Grant recipient program staff (such as the project director), facilitators who deliver either the SRAE program or comparison programming, and partner staff at the community sites where program implementation occurs. The study team expects to conduct staff interviews with up to 32 respondents (two grant recipient program staff, 12 facilitators delivering programming, and two partner staff per community site at up to nine sites).
- **Instrument 3 Youth focus group protocol:** Youth participating in the study who are receiving the SRAE program or comparison programming. The study team expects up to 60 participants for focus groups, with youth drawn from those who receive SRAE and comparison programming. Target respondents for the youth focus groups are the same as the target respondents for Instrument 1 Youth Survey.

Sampling and Site Selection

The study team is working with grant recipient staff to identify up to nine community sites that operate the summer youth employment program to serve as study sites. Community sites will be included in the study if their leadership is supportive of and agrees to participate in the study, the site has space that is large enough and equipped to deliver the SRAE and comparison programming, and the site is geographically located close enough to a population center that is feasible for facilitators and youth to travel to on a daily basis for the program.

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

All youth in the target population interested in participating in the program at study sites are eligible to participate in the study.

Impact Evaluation

All eligible youth enrolled in the SRAE program at the community site are eligible for the study and will be asked to complete consent forms (Appendix A). All youth with consent to participate in the study that complete the pre-program survey will be part of the study. After completing the pre-program survey, youth will be randomly assigned to the intervention group (which receives the SRAE program) or the comparison group (which receives an alternative program of the same length) and informed of their assignment. In some cases, youth may participate in the SRAE program with other youth that they live with (such as siblings, cousins, and other relatives). In this case, the study team will randomly assign members of the same household together, so they are all in the same condition. This minimizes the threat of contamination within a household, where one youth shares information learned in their condition with another youth randomized to the other condition.

Implementation Evaluation

The implementation study will be based on two types of data collection, some of which involve nonprobability purposeful sampling:

1. **Program staff interviews (Instrument 2).** The study team will coordinate with the grant recipient staff to identify respondents for staff interviews. In particular, the study team will ask the grant recipient staff for the names of all facilitators, a point of contact at each community site, and relevant staff at the grant recipient organization. The study team will work with the point of contact to learn about the site structure and select participants for the staff interviews. Potential participants include program facilitators, grant recipient program staff (such as project director), and partner staff at the community sites. All program staff will complete written consent before completing interviews (Appendix B). Purposeful staff selection is appropriate because particular insights and information available from individuals will depend on their perspectives based on their role at the organization.
2. **Youth focus groups (Instrument 3).** The study team will conduct focus groups at a subset of up to three study sites, aiming for a mix of sites, including those that had different facilitators delivering the programs and the size of cohorts of youth served. The team will use a convenience sample, selecting sites for focus groups based on timing of programming, and availability of site staff and study staff. The study team plans to recruit enough youth for each focus group to provide a range of perspectives on their experiences with the SRAE program and comparison services. Focus groups will provide qualitative feedback on youth's perception of programming.

The implementation study will also use some data from **Instrument 1 Youth Survey** around program experience and youth engagement. The sampling details are discussed in the Impact Evaluation section above.

B3. Design of Data Collection Instruments

Development of Data Collection Instruments

Impact Evaluation

For Instrument 1 Youth Survey, the study team reviewed the program model for SRAE programming, instruments used in previous studies of SRAE programs, and variables that have been identified as predictors of sexual risk avoidance outcomes. The study team selected items that aligned with SRAE

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

programs and are appropriate for high school aged youth. Table 1 maps outcomes to measures on the youth survey. The study team reviewed multiple OMB-approved instruments to identify potential questions for the youth survey that align with the outcomes, including the Strengthening Relationship Education and Marriage Services Youth Survey (OMB No. 0970-0481), and the Components Evaluation of REAL Essentials Youth Survey (OMB. No. 0990-0480), and surveys used in prior studies of similar programs.¹ The study team used validated items from previous surveys administered to similar populations to the extent possible.

Table 1. Outcome measures for impact evaluation, by administration time point of youth survey

Outcome	Measure	Assessed on pre-program survey	Assessed on immediate post-program survey	Assessed on 6-month follow-up survey
Knowledge of sexual health and prevention methods	Knowledge of condoms/correct use of condoms	X	X	X
	Knowledge of reproductive health	X	X	X
	Knowledge of STIs	X	X	X
	Knowledge of sexual consent	X	X	X
Increased self-esteem and confidence in making healthy decisions	Future orientation: education milestones	X	X	X
	Future orientation: employment	X	X	X
	Goal setting	X	X	X
	Responsible decision-making	X	X	X
	Decisions around sex/refusal skills	X	X	X
	Decision making around drug/alcohol use	X	X	X
	Self-efficacy around drug and alcohol use	X	X	X
	Intentions around sexual activity	X	X	X
	Attitudes about healthy romantic relationships	X	X	X
	Violence and healthy relationships	X	X	X
Improved peer relationships and support networks	Relationship with parents/caregivers	X	X	X
	Friendship quality	X	X	X
	Prosocial peers	X	X	X
	Extracurricular activities	X		X
	Peer norms about sexual initiation	X	X	X
Strengthened cultural identity and pride	Cultural identity	X	X	X
Reduction in risky behaviors related to sexual health	Sexually active	X		X
	Frequency of sex	X		X
	Alcohol use	X		X
	Drug use	X		X
	Opportunity (pre-sexual behaviors)	X		X
	Romantic relationship experiences	X		X
Decreased rate of teen	Pregnancy	X		X
	Ever been diagnosed for STIs	X		X

¹ Tingey, L., B. Mullany, R. Strom, R. Hastings, A. Barlow, and A. Rompalo. "The Respecting the Circle of Life Trial for American Indian Adolescents: Rationale, Design, Methods and Baseline Characteristics." *AIDS Care*, vol. 27, no. 7, 2015, pp. 885-891. doi:10.1080/09540121.2015.1015481.

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

pregnancy and STIs				
---------------------------	--	--	--	--

The survey was pretested with nine high school youth from near one of the community sites where the SRAE grant recipient operates during spring 2025. The youth completed hard copy surveys on their own and then participated in a debriefing session with the study team. The team used the pre-test to ensure that questions were understandable and that the language and terms used were familiar to respondents, as well as to identify typical instrumentation problems such as unclear question wording and incomplete or inappropriate response categories. The study team made revisions to the survey based on pretest participant feedback. The survey will be programmed into a web-based software application (e.g., Forsta). Mathematica staff will thoroughly test the web survey prior to fielding it with youth.

Implementation Evaluation

The implementation study instruments were developed by content experts at Mathematica and OPRE, and reviewed by the grant recipient. The study team developed the staff interview and youth focus group protocols (Instrument 2 and 3, respectively) to address four research topics that help to better understand the implementation delivery and to contextualize the impact evaluation findings. The four research topics covered are: (1) fidelity to the curriculum as written; (2) youth attendance; (3) youth engagement and rapport with facilitators; and (4) fit of the program to setting. (See section A2 for more information on the topics and research questions for each topic.) Table 2 notes how the instruments map to the four topics.

Table 2. Topics addressed in the implementation evaluation instruments

Topic	Instrument 1: Youth survey (immediate post-program)	Instrument 2: Staff interview protocol	Instrument 3: Youth focus group protocol
Fidelity to the curriculum as written		X	
Youth attendance		X	X
Youth engagement and rapport with facilitators	X	X	X
Fit of the program to setting		X	X

Through the staff interview and youth focus group protocols (Instrument 2 and 3), interviewers will ask open-ended questions so respondents can provide detailed qualitative responses about their experiences. Both protocols were designed to be concise and streamline data collection to only collect the information necessary to answer the research questions and ask questions relevant to the particular respondent type.

The engagement and program experience questions on the youth post-program survey were drawn from similar questions asked on other evaluations (the Components Study of REAL Essentials Advance

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

(REA) (OMB No. 0990-0480)) and adapted from established measures of engagement and facilitator alliance (School Engagement Scale²; cognitive engagement measure³, Learning Alliance Inventory⁴).

B4. Collection of Data and Quality Control

Impact Evaluation

All youth participating in the SRAE program will be eligible to participate in the study. Consent and youth assent forms will be sent home in the SRAE program materials. All youth with consent and assent will complete the youth survey at the pre-program administration. The pre-program survey administration will be overseen by study staff. Youth will complete the web-based survey using a study team-provided device. If youth are unable to complete the survey due to limited internet connectivity, they will be provided with a hard-copy version of the survey. Study staff will oversee administration of the youth survey at immediate post-program following the same procedures as the pre-program administration.

The study will reach out directly to youth via email and text to invite them to complete the 6-month follow-up survey on their own over the web (Appendix C). The study team will use the contact information that youth provide for themselves and their parents at program enrollment for these outreach efforts, including email, text and phone reminders. This information is collected by the grant recipient as part of program enrollment and will be securely shared with the study team for all youth with study consent. For hard-to-reach youth, trained members of the study team will go into the field to locate youth in-person and ask them to complete the survey over the web.

The study team will ensure quality and consistency in the data collected on the surveys by using different tactics, such as:

- Train staff on in-person survey administration procedures for the pre-program and post-program administration, including how to respond to questions on survey content neutrally to not bias responses.
- Train staff on random assignment procedures.
- Debrief with in-person administrators shortly after the start of a data collection to discuss the respondents' level of cooperation and if they consistently asked questions on specific survey items or processes.
- For web surveys: provide clear instructions; use clear and straightforward language; include predominantly closed-ended questions; include check boxes, drop-down menus, and response categories; include data checks to prevent outlier entries and inconsistent responses; and ensure the layout is compatible with multiple browsers, tablets, and smartphones.
- Train staff on data entries procedures for hard copy surveys and perform quality control checks on entries, with retraining and more validations based on results of initial checks.

² Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P., Friedel, J., & Paris, A. (2005). School Engagement. In K. A. Moore & L. H. Lippman (Eds.), *What do children need to flourish: Conceptualizing and measuring indicators of positive development* (pp. 305–321). Springer Science + Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-23823-9_19

³ Rotgans, J.I., Schmidt, H.G. Cognitive engagement in the problem-based learning classroom. *Adv in Health Sci Educ* **16**, 465–479 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-011-9272-9>

⁴ Rogers, Daniel T. (2012) "The Learning Alliance Inventory: Instrument Development and Initial Validation," *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*: Vol. 6: No. 1, Article 9. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstl.2012.060109>

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

- Provide a project hotline and Help Desk email that participants can use if they have questions while completing the surveys for the 6-month follow-up administration.
- Examine frequencies and cross-tabulations on data collected on a regular basis to pinpoint any unexpected aspects of instrumentation, particularly in skip logic, valid value ranges, the operation of edits and consistency checks, and the recording of data for legitimately skipped items and “don’t know” and refusal responses.

Implementation Evaluation

The implementation study will collect data through these two additional instruments:

- **Staff interviews.** The study team will interview program staff either in-person or virtually (Instrument 2). To ensure quality and consistency in data collection, all interviewers will be trained in the study research questions, the research approach, the topics to be covered in the data collection, and techniques for data collection (including protecting privacy, preparing post-interview summaries, and ensuring data security). The training will also cover the content of the instruments to ensure full understanding of the questions and the collection of comparable, complete, and high-quality data across the team. If respondents consent to being recorded, the interviewer will audio record the discussions. Task leaders for the implementation study will periodically review completed interviews for quality and for missing information.
- **Youth focus groups.** Two researchers from the study team will conduct the youth focus groups (Instrument 3), with one as a lead interviewer and one as a notetaker, either virtually or in-person. Focus group moderators will be trained as described in the Staff Interview section above, with additional content on focus group moderation best practices.

B5. Response Rates and Potential Nonresponse Bias

Response Rates

The youth surveys, youth focus groups, and staff interviews are not designed to produce statistically generalizable findings – the findings will not generalize beyond the participating individuals and sites in the study.

Impact Evaluation

For Instrument 1 Youth Survey, the expected response rate for each administration are as follows:

- **Pre-program survey administration:** 100 percent as completing the survey at pre-program is a condition of being enrolled in the study.
- **Immediate-post program administration:** 90 percent response rate of youth enrolled in the study, to account for youth attrition during the program. This estimate aligns with similar experiences on immediate post program surveys, such as the Strengthening Relationship Education and Marriage Services (STREAMS) Evaluation, OMB Control Number 0970-0481 and the Components Evaluation of REAL Essentials Youth Survey, OMB Control Number 0990-0480.
- **Six-month follow up administration:** 80 percent response rate of youth enrolled in the study, to account for surveying youth outside of the program setting. An 80 percent response rate will provide an adequate number of responses to help ensure quality data and that respondents are representative of the sample population and to ensure the study has sufficient statistical power (see B7). This estimate aligns with similar experiences on other youth data collection activities of similar programs, such as the Federal Evaluation of Making Proud Choices (MPC; OMB Control Number 0990-0452) and the Personal Responsibility Education Program (PREP; OMB Control

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

Number 0970-0398). The study team will use in-person locating for cases they cannot reach through email and text message invites to boost response rates.

Implementation Evaluation

The qualitative data collection activities (Instruments 2 and 3) are not designed to produce statistically generalizable findings, and participation is wholly at the respondent's discretion. Response rates will not be calculated or reported. To maximize participation, the study team will work closely with administrators and staff to develop recruitment strategies for participants and program staff for focus groups and interviews, particularly to ensure the respondents reflect a group with a mix of experiences.

NonResponse

Impact Evaluation

For the youth survey, the study team will take steps to understand the nature of any non-response and to account for the threat it may pose to the validity of the study's impact estimates. Using data from the pre-program survey, the study team will first test for statistically significant differences across demographic and pre-program survey outcome variables for youth who complete the follow-up survey and by whether youth receive the SRAE or comparison program. The study team will control for these differences using covariates when estimating program impacts. At the six-month follow-up, the study team will examine response rates to detect any differences in attrition between the youth who receive each program and adjust accordingly.

To reduce any bias resulting from item nonresponse, the study team will impute values for missing data. Imputation is particularly useful in cases in which data might be systematically missing related to an observable characteristic. For example, if a study participant has never been sexually active, the study team knows that the answer to if they have been pregnant is "no".

Implementation Evaluation

Participants will not be randomly sampled, and findings are not intended to be representative. Consequently, the study team will not calculate nonresponse bias. Respondent demographics will be documented and reported in written materials associated with data collection.

B6. Production of Estimates and Projections

Impact Evaluation

The study team will use the youth survey as a data source to analyze the change in youth outcomes from pre-program to immediately after the end of programming and then six months after the program ends. The study team will use regression analysis to construct more efficient estimators than the simple difference-in-means estimators (as described below). All analyses will be conducted using participant-level data. The study team will also analyze attendance data to examine how much of the intended programming youth received.

Implementation Evaluation

The data will not be used to generate population estimates, either for internal use or dissemination. The implementation study will describe the implementation of the program, in terms of youth attendance, program fidelity, youth engagement and rapport with facilitators, and fit of the program to the implementation setting. This information will help interpret the impact evaluation findings.

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

B7. Data Handling and Analysis

Data Handling

No personally identifiable information (PII) will be shared outside of the study team. Survey data and qualitative data, including typed notes and audio recordings, will be stored on Mathematica's secure network, which is accessible only to the study team, and disposed of per ACF's record retention protocols. All data will be saved under ID codes, rather than respondents' names. All transcripts from interviews and focus groups will be de-identified to remove PII. Any information linking ID codes and respondents' PII will be saved on Mathematica's secure restricted drive and will be password protected. More details specific to each data source are shared below.

Impact Evaluation

The youth surveys will be programmed with Mathematica's web-based survey software (e.g., Forsta). Error messages will be programmed into the web-based survey to alert respondents to inconsistencies between data elements, values beyond the expected range, and similar issues. Respondents have an opportunity to correct such errors before the data are submitted. No PII will be pre-programmed into the survey.

Any surveys from the pre-program and immediate post-program administrations collected via hard copy will be shipped to Mathematica via a shipping vendor (e.g., FedEx). The study team and site staff will be trained on secure data handling procedures. All hard copy materials will be securely stored at all times, and all information containing PII will be kept separate from materials containing survey data. For example, completed consent forms will be shipped separately from completed surveys. Surveys will be received at Mathematica and data entered into the web-based survey.

Once a sufficient number of responses have been received, the study team will conduct an initial quality check to identify any potential issues with the data. Additional data quality checks will be conducted throughout the study. Following data collection, the study team will conduct comprehensive data reviews and quality assurance reviews to ensure skip patterns are enforced and data are complete and within expected ranges.

Implementation Evaluation

Data collected through interviews and focus groups will be audio-recorded with participant permission. The data will be transcribed and de-identified to remove any PII. Multiple individuals will code the data, and the study lead will conduct quality assurance checks to ensure the transcription is accurate and free from identifiable information.

Data Analysis

Impact Evaluation

For the impact evaluation, the study team will analyze the change in youth outcomes from pre-program to immediately after programming and then six months later. The team will estimate a regression model that includes an indicator of the program treatment status as well as baseline characteristics to improve the precision of the impact estimates and statistically adjust for any differences.

With an enrolled sample of 500 youth, the study will have 80% power to detect an effect of at least 0.20 standard deviations for risk and protective factor outcomes, and an effect of at least 0.24 standard deviations for sexual behavior outcomes (equivalent to a 12 percentage point reduction of an outcome

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

with a 50% prevalence rate).⁵ While some audiences might be concerned about the magnitude of these minimum detectable effects, the recent impact evaluation of the Making Proud Choices! program showed similarly sized impacts on risk and protective factors – the average impacts for these outcomes was 0.18 standard deviations, and several were larger than 0.20.⁶ And while the minimum detectable effect size for behaviors is even larger in magnitude, the Respecting the Circle of Life evaluation showed impacts on sexual behavior outcomes of 0.40 standard deviations for recent sex, and 0.25 standard deviations for sexual initiation outcomes.⁷ Therefore, this evaluation does appear to be sufficiently powered to detect impacts of this size, provided that the intervention is as effective as these other programs.

In addition, even if the study ultimately produces smaller, non-significant impacts on risk and protective factors or sexual behavior outcomes, the proposed evaluation design will still be able to communicate the potential promise of the program. The study team proposes to use a novel Bayesian Interpretation approach called BASIE to calculate the Bayesian posterior probability – the probability that the SRAE program truly has favorable impacts, given the observed impact estimates for each outcome and information about the effectiveness of comparable programs.⁸ In doing so, the study team will be able to present findings that suggest, for example, that “there is a 77 percent probability that the SRAE program is favorably affecting risky sexual behavior” even if the inferential test shows that there is a nonsignificant impact on this outcome.

Implementation Evaluation

For interviews and focus groups data, the study team will employ a thematic approach to analyze qualitative data. Both deductive and inductive coding strategies will be used to code the data. Deductive codes, aligned with the study's research questions, will be predefined. Additionally, inductive coding will be applied to recognize themes and categories that emerge organically from the data, which may or may not directly align with the research questions. To ensure the reliability of the coding, the assignment of codes to text will be regularly reviewed and adjusted as needed. After coding is complete, the codes will be analyzed both within and across cases to identify key themes for each case and to draw comparisons and contrasts between cases, ultimately leading to the identification of overarching themes.

For the close-ended items on the youth survey data at the immediate post-program administration, the study team will calculate simple summary statistics (mean and range), by condition.

Data Use

⁵ This is based on a two-tailed hypothesis test with $\alpha = 0.05$, and 80% response rates among the enrolled sample. We assume that 50% of the variance in risk and protective factors and that 25% of the variance in sexual behavior will be explained by covariates.

⁶ Cole, R., T. Schulte Neelan, A. Langan, B. Keating, J. Walzer, S. Asheer, and S. Zief. “The Impact of the Making Proud Choices! Teen Pregnancy Prevention Curriculum.” Washington, DC: Office of Population Affairs, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2022.

⁷ Tingey, L., R. Chambers, H. Patel, S. Littlepage, S. Lee, A. Lee, D. Susan, L. Melgar, A. Slimp, and S. Rosenstock. Prevention of Sexually Transmitted Diseases and Pregnancy Prevention Among Native American Youths: A Randomized Controlled Trial 2016–2018. *American Journal of Public Health* 111, p. 1874–1884, <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2021.306447>.

⁸ Deke, J., and M. Finucane. “Moving Beyond Statistical Significance: “The BASIE (BAYesian Interpretation of Estimates) Framework for Interpreting Findings from Impact Evaluations.” OPRE report #2019-35. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, 2019.

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

The study team will develop a final report that outlines the immediate and short-term impacts of the SRAE program and the implementation evaluation findings. The study team may also use findings from this study to develop issue briefs, reports, or webinars for grant recipients, federal staff, researchers, and/or training/technical assistance providers on lessons learned, such as implementation challenges and successes of delivering a SRAE program in a community setting during the summer.

B8. Contact Persons

Table 3 lists the federal and contract staff responsible for the study, including their affiliation and email address.

Table 3. Staff responsible for study

Name	Affiliation	Email address
Calonie Gray	Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation Administration for Children and Families U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Calonie.Gray@acf.hhs.gov
MeGan Hill	Family and Youth Services Bureau Administration for Children and Families U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Megan.Hill@acf.hhs.gov
Tia Brown	Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation Administration for Children and Families U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Tia.Brown@acf.hhs.gov
Nakia Martin-Wright	Family and Youth Services Bureau Administration for Children and Families U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Nakia.Martin-Wright@acf.hhs.gov
Heather Zaveri	Mathematica	HZaveri@mathematica-mpr.com
Lauren Tingey	Mathematica	LTingey@mathematica-mpr.com
Betsy Keating	Mathematica	EKeating@mathematica-mpr.com
Jennifer Walzer	Mathematica	JWalzer@mathematica-mpr.com

Attachments

Instrument 1: Youth survey

Instrument 2: Staff interview protocol

Instrument 3: Youth focus group protocol

Appendix A: Parental consent form, consent form for youth over 18, and assent form for youth

Appendix B: Consent form for staff participating in interviews

Appendix C: Outreach materials for six-month follow-up survey