

**Evaluation of Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence
Teleconference Call Transcript**

Page 1

**Moderator: Katharine Darke Schmitt
April 27, 2005**

Operator: Good day ladies and gentlemen and welcome to the 2005 Safe Start Promising Approaches evaluation. At this time all participants are on listen only mode. Later, we will conduct a question and answer session and instructions will follow at that time. If you should require operator assistance, please press * then zero on your touchtone telephone. As a reminder, this conference is being recorded.

I would now like to introduce your host for today's conference, Ms. Katharine Darke Schmitt of OJJDP. Ms. Darke Schmitt, you may begin.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Thanks Tanya. Well, good afternoon everyone. This is Katharine Darke Schmitt from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Thank you for dialing into this, which is the first of two applicant conference calls which we will have on the solicitation for the evaluation of Safe Start Promising Approaches. The next call is scheduled for Thursday, May 5th, also at 3:00 pm, Eastern Time, and you are welcome to join us again then if you would care to.

The structure of the call will allow us both to give you some background about the program and -- of Safe Start Promising Approaches and, for that, my colleague, Kristin Kracke here at OJJDP is on the call. And then we will have time to talk about the specific requirements for the evaluation design that are described in the solicitation document; and you will have the opportunity to ask questions of Kristin and I twice; once at the end of Kristin's presentation and then again after mine, towards the end of the call.

I want to make sure that you know that, if you have questions about the solicitation, that either do not get answered today or that come up for you later in the process, there is a telephone number at which you can leave your name and number and your question, and the program staff will call you back. And that telephone number is: 202-305-9234. I'll repeat that number, it is: 202-305-9234. That telephone number is voice mail only but we do check it faithfully and we are happy to return calls with questions about the requirements of the solicitation.

We are not able to comment on specific aspects of your proposal, of course, because that would be unfair to other applicants who didn't have personal coaching from the program staff.

So I am going to stop here and introduce Kristin Kracke. Kristin is the Initiative Director of the Safe Start Program which has been going on at the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention for many -- I think close to seven or eight years. Kristin is going to focus her remarks mostly on the phase of Safe Start which is being evaluated under this solicitation, and that phase is called Safe Start Promising Approaches. But she can answer questions you have also on the history of Safe Start; should those arise. So Kristin, you go ahead and then, Tanya, we will prompt you when we are ready for questions at the end of Kristin's presentation.

Kristin Kracke: Okay, thank you very much Katharine and, first of all, let me say thank you to everyone for your interest in this evaluation opportunity. I am going to briefly highlight and review the Safe Start Promising Approaches solicitation as it was designed for the

programmatic sites, but I do encourage everybody to read and read carefully that solicitation as it provides a lot of important context and background on the issue area and OJJDP's approach.

The primary goal of the Safe Start Promising Approaches project – pilot project, is to increase our knowledge base of -- around intervention in the area of children's exposure to violence; and then to use the data that we gather and the knowledge base that we established and form the development of a replication stage, or replication models, that will follow several years down.

We completed this solicitation last summer and are in the process of making selections now for approximately 14 sites for four years, funded at a level of \$210,000 per year. We have focused the definition of children's exposure to violence in three areas: CEV includes witnessing domestic violence, witnessing community violence as well as direct victimization -- being a victim of child abuse, or neglect. So -- child maltreatment in general.

We have not included in the definition the broader terminology or issue area around the issue of trauma, so we have tried to narrow people's project designs around violence -- specific harm. So, intent to harm and the proximal distance between the child witnessing or experiencing the trauma from a violent event. Whether they were present at the scene and the intimacy involved between the child and the adult caregiver that is being harmed – whether they were there at the house or whether – even if they weren't at the house, if it was their mother or their father that -- the impact of that harm is greater.

So, with those three types of CEV, areas of children's exposure to violence being included in the definition, we are looking for sites to define very clearly the points of entry in their project design and to provide a project design that is very comprehensive in nature, and that makes sense for that community.

So it is possible for applicants to narrow their definition of CEV for their community to include only domestic violence and child abuse and neglect if, for example, it is a rural community and there is very little community violence. It makes sense that they would not have as comprehensive of a project design but we really are looking for and it was part of the solicitation for the sites, to – that -- applicants to assess for themselves what an appropriate project design would be.

So if the project design is first responder, enforcement, or emergency medical staff or ERs, are responding to incidences of violence where children are involved, that they not – [divide] community violence away from domestic violence; that they – as they are creating their system and their intervention, that they take a comprehensive and a cross-cutting approach.

A couple of other key things to highlight from the original project design is that the focus is on primarily zero to six; it is not exclusively zero to six; it can go zero to 18. We encourage applicants to respond appropriately and in a holistic way to whole families; but we have had the primary focus on zero to six because of the increased vulnerability of that population, and the increased impact to them in terms of harmful effects from the exposure.

And -- so also in the project design which will affect the ultimate evaluation processes, is clearly defined intersection in these areas of children's exposure. So who is going to be participating in the project design? Is it domestic violence, law enforcement, child protective services, mental health, early childhood, primary medical, public health – all of those sectors are involved in, or potentially involved in a project design; and so we have asked, while they're taking a comprehensive approach, ask them to define sort of

the nucleus or the core intersection within which they are going to work. So that they may clearly define and establish points of entry, identification screening or referral and treatment, treatment or intervention approaches.

So that's it in a nutshell. Katharine, I think you want to open it up for questions at this point?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Kristin, if you're ready to take some. Tanya, we're ready for applicants to ask questions, particularly about the selection of and the activities of the Safe Start Promising Approaches sites. So -- we will be back on to talk about the evaluation structure as soon as Kristin has a chance to address some of these questions, so if you will hold those we'll take them at another point in the call. Tanya, when you're ready.

Operator: Yes, ladies and gentlemen, if you have a question at this time, please press the "1" key on your touch tone telephone. If your question has been answered and you wish to remove yourself from the queue, please press the # key. Our first question comes from Dale Parent. Your question please.

Dale Parent: The question is how many applications did you get for the -- for those sites?

Kristin Kracke: Approximately 200.

Dale Parent: Thank you.

Operator: Our next question comes from Terri Covington. Your question please.

Terri Covington: Hi, Kristin. My question is: We already have a program in place that has been up and running for about a year. Would we be able to utilize that program for our application?

Kristin Kracke: Your application for the -- for the -- to be a pilot site?

Terri Covington: Exactly.

Kristin Kracke: That solicitation closed last summer and we are in the process of completing the review process and making -- completing the review and making selection and announcements. So unfortunately that's what -- because the solicitation is closed and we are in mid-process, there is no way to participate in that stage now. The only thing that is open is the evaluation component.

Terri Covington: Okay. Thank you.

Operator: Our next question comes from Jane Grady. Your question please.

Jane Grady: Will the treatment begin before the evaluator is selected, at the treatment sites?

Kristin Kracke: Katharine, do you want to take that?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Jane, we are doing our best to make sure that that does not happen; however, those of you who have worked with federal grants before may be used to the uncertainty that surrounds some of our time line. It is our goal to have the evaluation competition over so quickly that the evaluator is selected and informed before the programs implement any of their actual treatment. However, it is possible that the program sites would begin some preliminary activities, such as hiring staff, before the national evaluator is onboard.

Jane Grady: Can I ask one more question related to that?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yes, absolutely.

Jane Grady: Will then the evaluator have input into the selection of the treatment site instruments?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yes. And this is a question we can discuss further in the second half of the call which focuses on the evaluation; but it is our intention that the national evaluator, not only give input as to what data collection instruments are used, but actually help shape all of the sites' use of data collection instruments. And that is one of the issues that we are considering as we try to get this timed right.

Jane Grady: Okay. I have one more question. Is that okay?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: It's okay.

Jane Grady: What input are the treatment sites going to have into the selection of the control sites?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: We asked the treatment sites, as they submitted their applications, to recommend to us from where they would consider an appropriate comparison or control population would come, such as: Does their agency have a system by which they could easily track clients into separate groups, or is there a neighboring community which is similar enough in the kinds of demographic sort of characteristics that we consider important, that might serve well?

Some sites did a very good job of answering that question; some sites were less sophisticated in their understanding of the control and comparison groups and did not give us very good questions -- responses to that. However, it is ultimately up to the national evaluator to make the final decision, not the site.

Jane Grady: Okay. Thank you.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Sure.

Operator: Our next question comes from Cindy Crusto. Your question please.

Cindy Crusto: I am just wondering -- I know that all the sites have not been selected yet, but I am wondering, once they are, will we be able to know which population they are focusing on? I know they can serve zero to 18 but just in terms of selection of instruments for appropriate age groups?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Kristin, that -- what do you think?

Kristin Kracke: I -- in the context of that happening before the RFP for the evaluation is closed, no that will not happen before then, but certainly that will be information for the selected evaluator -- will be readily available.

Cindy Crusto: Okay.

Operator: Our next question comes from Glenda Kaufman-Cantor. Your question please.

Glenda Kaufman-Cantor: Yes, I was wondering: Is there an attempt to get -- kind of cut a wide swath in terms of the geographical, cultural, urban, rural mix in regard to sites?

Kristin Kracke: There isn't and I would say even more particularly in getting a breadth of -- across the continuum in the intervention intersection, if you will, to get a broad range. However, I am finding, in reviewing the review process, that there is tending to be more of a cluster.

Glenda Kaufman-Cantor: So, it's focused more urban, you mean, or –

Kristin Kracke: No, I mean in terms of intervention approach; that there are people who have tended to propose fairly similar intervention approaches –

Glenda Kaufman-Cantor: I see.

Kristin Kracke: But that would be our first lens or filter and it's to try to get breadth across the intervention intersection.

Glenda Kaufman-Cantor: Okay. All right, well –

Kristin Kracke: More so than geographic.

Glenda Kaufman-Cantor: Hmm. Okay.

Kristin Kracke; But yes, rural and urban and tribal are all part of the eligible candidates, and we do have a pool to select from that whole range.

Glenda Kaufman-Cantor: Hmm, okay. Thank you.

Operator: Our next question comes from Douglas Wilson. Your question please.

Douglas Wilson: Yes, thank you. Could you quickly review the first 11 sites that were funded and the evaluation and so forth – just to give some context to this?

Kristin Kracke: What do you mean when you say “review”? To describe what the demonstration effort was?

Douglas Wilson: Well, when you look on the – I think it's the National Center for Violence website, the children's violence website -- you find 11 descriptions of what the sites are planning to do. Nothing about what they did and – or how they are progressing; and nothing – almost nothing about the evaluation team. I did find one group that had some – done some evaluation but it strongly implied there were other people on the national evaluation team; in fact it was called NET. I guess I would like to know a little bit about the background and – to make this question even more complex: Are those organizations eligible to compete on this evaluation?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: While Kristin prepares her thoughts about – briefly discussing the 11 original Safe Start sites, Doug, let me tackle the evaluation end of your question, and also make sure that everyone on the call understands the context of Doug's question.

Doug is asking about the first phase of Safe Start which had 11 sites; it was initiated in 1998. Those sites are nearly all the way through their funding cycle, so he is asking a historical question and not asking about the Safe Start Promising Approaches sites which are the ones that will be evaluated under this solicitation.

And Doug, the evaluation end of your question is easier and quicker than the program end, so I will do that first --

Douglas Wilson: (Laugh). Okay, that's fine.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Before turning this over to Kristin.

The initial Safe Start Program was evaluated by a team of folks who received grants from OJJDP and they came primarily from two organizations. The first is Caliber

Associates and the second is the Association for the Study and Development of Community, and together we refer to those organizations as the National Evaluation Team.

There are some products available from the evaluation of the 11 Safe Start sites and you will see the URL for where those products are available posted on the FAQ and on other – and on the web page which describes this solicitation. However, you are correct in that there is ongoing work evaluating the 11 sites, which is not yet available to you because, either it hasn't been completed or it has not been reviewed and approved by the agency yet.

Douglas Wilson: And are those – my impressions from looking at what documents I could find, if I may continue – is that a lot of it seemed to be process or formative evaluation work. Is there an outcome evaluation side also?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: There is, Doug, the sort of beginnings of an outcome evaluation side; that will be the very last piece to be completed and so will be of no use to you all who are now preparing your applications. But you are correct in the assertion that the evaluation of the initial Safe Start Program, these 11 sites, was largely formative and that is a result largely of the fact that the initial thrust of Safe Start was not only providing services to children and families, but also establishing systems change that made identifying and serving those children possible. So a lot of this systems change evaluation piece reads as very process and formative oriented.

And you had also asked: Are the members of the first national evaluation team eligible to apply under this solicitation and the answer is: Yes, they are.

Kristin Kracke: Katharine, is this the segue for me to pick up?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yes, that's your segue.

Kristin Kracke: The answer to whether the 11 sites – the 11 sites of the demonstration are not eligible to apply as pilot sites in the next phase. So, that's the second part of that overall question.

The overall mission and purpose or vision for the demonstration effort was really to establish innovation in the area of children's exposure; there was very little known in the field at an intervention or a practice level around children's exposure when this effort was started. There are a few pilot programs out there in the country but very – a fairly new field; and so we didn't really feel like, as an agency, that there was a lot of information that would lead us or direct us to particular venues. Plus there is an overlay in the demonstration sites around establishing a broad – it's a broad, comprehensive approach in asking the sites to establish a continuum of care across prevention, intervention, treatment and response, whereas the Safe Start Promising Approaches pilot is more focused on intervention. It does include policy and service coordination type – issues and changes within it, but it is very much focused on particular intervention realm.

So that is one difference and distinction; and within that full continuum the sites are asked to innovate and to come up with – with approaches that would lead us to this next stage of developing a Promising Approaches pilot where we can focus more specifically and – I think a lot of the people propose -- putting in proposals under the pilot site solicitation last summer, drew on some of the practices, experiences that the demonstration sites had.

It is also why the evaluation hasn't, and – Katharine, I don't think you mentioned that -- but there is a local evaluation and national evaluation component to the

demonstration effort – that has given us specific information about each local site while also capturing the national cross-site effort.

Douglas Wilson: Am I still on?

Kristin Kracke: Umhmm.

Douglas Wilson: Okay. So basically the difference between the first 11 sites and these next 14 is moving from innovation to testing of some possible best practices?

Kristin Kracke: Yes.

Douglas Wilson: Okay.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Kristin, do you want to speak to the evidence-based requirement that was in your solicitation?

Kristin Kracke: For SSPA?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yes.

Kristin Kracke: Sure, just that there was one. We did ask the applicants coming in for that, that proposal, to draw on the practices, not just from the demonstration sites but for the other collective efforts in the field that is emerging and has continued to grow since the late 90s when we started this effort. So, in addition to building on those promising practices, we have required the program proposals to include evidence-based research and to provide us with whatever data that they have. Also, around -- just their current community context. What data they have around children, children's exposure, and incidents, and what data gaps that they have. So, we have directed the sites to utilize the knowledge that exists.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Doug, does that address your question?

Douglas Wilson: Well, I have other questions when we get to the evaluation part, but –

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Okay. We will bring you back on for those.

Douglas Wilson: I'll play by the rules.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Thanks Doug. All right, Tanya, I think we are ready for the next one.

Operator: Our next question comes from Phillip Graham. Your question please.

Phillip Graham: I was wondering whether or not you were able to give a sense of the size or number of individuals served within each of the 14 funded communities?

Kristin Kracke: Since we have not fully decided what the 14 sites are, I cannot; but I can tell you that it is a good question because it ranges a lot depending on the jurisdiction that is in the nature of the intersection, because they are proposing different intersections or different interventions. So – but I would say probably the smallest range is 30 and Katharine and I are vetting them to see – make sure that their numbers are adequate.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: And Phil, you will see in the solicitation for the evaluation that we have asked you for budgeting purposes etc., to anticipate that each site will serve 50 children per year.

Phillip Graham: Okay. Thank you.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Okay Tanya, we are ready.

Operator: I'm showing no further questions.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Okay. With no further questions about the program side, although all is not lost if one occurs to you as we continue because, if Kristin is not still on the call, I will do my best to tackle it or we will put it in the "Frequently Asked Questions" document.

Let's talk a bit about the structure that the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is requiring for this evaluation. The agency and, in fact, the executive department as a whole, has been focusing on using good science to demonstrate, not only process and formative sorts of outputs, but also child and family based outcomes from the funds that are delivered. Kristin and I and others who assisted us in the development of this solicitation for the evaluation, put a lot of effort into learning from past solicitations -- what kind of structure is most likely to get us a very high quality evaluation which will produce reliable outcome data?

Now, as always in the evaluation field in social science, that is complicated by the fact that we have human subjects here, so we are not anticipating that a perfectly pristine clinical sort of study is going to be possible. However, we are asking, as you can tell from the language used in the solicitation, for a fairly rigorous approach which will include a comparison or control group drawn for each of the funded program sites. And the national evaluator, as we have previously discussed in the call, will be responsible for identifying, recruiting, retaining and collecting data from, the comparison or control group at each site.

So, one of the significant products in your proposal, should you choose to submit one, will be to tell us how you propose to do that and what strategies you have used with what success in the past, to enlist human comparison and control groups. That will enable you to carry out a quasi-experimental design which is the goal -- of course the best possible standard we can hope for in the social sciences, I believe. It is not critical to us that every site have a control group, a non-random comparison matched group will serve our purposes well, if you can justify how your plan will allow you to get there.

The national evaluator's other responsibilities are going to include finalizing the selection of data collection instruments that will be used by all the sites, and this will be complicated by the fact that some sites will likely have professional, either PhD or clinical staff, collecting data; and some sites may have, sort of, quasi-professional case worker-type people collecting data. So that will have to be an area in which the national evaluator is well educated and flexible in terms of what options one has depending on the qualifications of your data collector.

The sites are required to collect a series of variables which were spelled out to them in there -- the solicitation that was issued last summer; and that list of variables is also available to you in your solicitation if, as you develop your evaluation design, you note that there are other specific pieces of data that you need which we did not account for when we wrote the solicitation to the site; we can incorporate those now and ensure that the states are reliably reporting to you the data that you need.

The states -- each of the sites has set aside \$10,000 per year for the purpose of collecting data from their own treatment group and it will be their responsibility to collect the data, get it into a spread sheet, and get that spread sheet to you. They have no further responsibilities for data collection; we are not asking them to do any kind of data analysis and, in fact, although some sites did propose doing some local evaluation work on their own, we discouraged that where we could because it has been our experience that the national evaluator needs to be at the helm of the evaluation effort, and that can sometimes

be a complicated relationship, if there are local evaluators with their own agendas on the scene.

However, we also cannot guarantee you that they won't be doing any local evaluation, just that your evaluation plans will have priority in terms of data collection and reporting from the sites.

So, once you have narrowed down the list of variables that you need from the sites and you have decided what instruments will be used by the sites to collect those data, you will also have to go into the comparison and control groups and make sure that you are collecting those data; and they are to be collected at six-month intervals over the life of the program, so that will be four years.

Your responsibilities to OJJDP come in the form of semi-annual progress reports to us; also in an annual evaluation meeting that you will plan here or perhaps we can negotiate elsewhere in the country in the out years, to which OJJDP staff, your staff, any local evaluation consultants whom you may choose to employ, and also representatives from the programs, will come together to talk about how the evaluation is going and do any troubleshooting that is necessary.

We anticipate that some sites will not have very sophisticated data collection mechanisms in place and, in fact, for some of them it is possible that this kind of data collection will be a new experience. And we will work with you, the national evaluator, to provide the technical assistance that is necessary to get the sites up and running in terms of collecting basic data; and, as I said, we anticipate that different sites will have different levels of needs. Some may need no assistance at all and others may need more assistance from you to make sure that they are getting you the data that you need.

Lastly, I will just mention that you will see that there is an addition to the evaluation questions related to the services provided to children exposed to violence. There is also a series of research questions related to children's resiliency. OJJDP is interested in knowing if, using the data that is going to be collected for the purpose of evaluating the Safe Start Promising Approaches sites, you are also able to tell us anything about what makes a child resilient to possible negative outcomes; and that is detailed in a separate paragraph in the solicitation.

This award will be made up to \$1 million for the first four years with a possible extension of \$500,000 for the fifth year, which is intended only to help you finish up data collection and report writing. This – the funding mechanism will be a cooperative agreement which means that you will be working in partnership with the OJJDP staff, which includes both myself on the evaluation side and Kristin and her staff on the program side. So you should anticipate that this will be a fairly collaborative relationship between the government and the contractor who is selected to do the work.

We are interested in hearing ideas you have about how to structure your evaluation, whether you intend to manage and staff the national evaluation entirely from your own office or headquarters, or whether you propose to engage local evaluators from the individual sites. If you decide to go that second route, then just as a matter of facilitating our relationships with the sites, we would like you to let the sites give you some input about who the likely resources in the area would be in terms of finding a good local evaluator; although ultimately again, the national evaluator will be able to make that decision on their own after considering input of the sites.

Tanya, I would like to open the floor again to take questions about the structure of the evaluation.

- Operator: Ladies and gentlemen, if you have a question at this time, please press the “1” key on your touchtone telephone. Our first question comes from Dale Parent. Your question please. Mr. Parent, your line is open.
- Dale Parent: Sorry, I had the “mute” button on. Given what you have described here you’re – it is likely like you’re going to have a substantial variety among the applicants – among the successful applicants, in terms of a lot of dimensions. And it would strike me that a sensible way to go; and I will just pose this and see if this is within your purview of your understanding of what the solicitation requires – would be for the evaluator to spend the initial period of the – of the study doing an evaluability assessment of the 14 sites, which could then inform a much more specific design than they would be able to do in the proposal itself. Is that consistent with your thinking about the solicitation, or not?
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Dale, I think that is a reasonable approach to take. The sites, if everything goes as planned, will begin serving children in the fall or winter of 2005 and therefore will start collecting data that early; and we would certainly not want that data to go to waste. So, while I do – I do think that it would be important to make sure you understand the sites’ initiatives – the sites’ interventions well, in order to thoroughly evaluate them, I would caution you against sending a proposal which indicated that, say for the first year –
- Dale Parent: Right.
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: You would be only focused on evaluability study.
- Dale Parent: Correct. I understand that. So we would be talking about a very intensive, up front activity?
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: I think this whole five years is going to be very intense for all of us, yes.
- Dale Parent: Thank you.
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Thank you.
- Operator: Our next question comes from James Trudeau. Your question please.
- James Trudeau: Well, sort of following up on the timing issue there. Will the – will the evaluator need to provide the OJJDP an OMB clearance package and, if so, can you speak some – to the time expected.
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yes, the evaluator will need to work with OJJDP to prepare an OMB clearance package and, in our experience, that takes between six and nine months. So that would need to be one of the first tasks undertaken by the evaluator.
- James Trudeau: Six to nine months for the clearance?
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yes.
- James Trudeau: Okay. Thank you.
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: My pleasure.
- Operator: Our next question comes from Kimberly Kendziora. Your question please.
- Kimberly Kendziora: Actually I have two questions. The first question – well -- has to do with the level of control that the national evaluator has around collecting data from the treatment sites. I mean, obviously there is a level of concern about having responsibility but not control

around data collection for half the sample. And -- can you describe the mechanisms that will be in place with the grant communities, around data collection and --

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Certainly. As we discussed, the sites have been given a list of variables which they are required to send us for children in their treatment group, at six-month intervals; and that data collection begins with the intake of every child. Once that child is entered as a case, the data needs to be tracked every six months throughout the program.

The program management staff here will hold the sites accountable for the data they collect, so it was made clear to them in the solicitation that their funding is contingent on the ready supply of data in the format that we have asked for. So we have some mechanism to enforce the regular collection of data by the sites, and then we will have the national evaluator whom we will send in to provide technical assistance if we come across a site which appears to be struggling. Although part of our selection criteria for the sites that Kristin and her peer reviewers are considering is the strength of the data collection plan proposed by the sites, and whether the sites seem capable of fulfilling their end of the bargain.

So it is true that the national evaluator does not necessarily have control over the actual collection of the data from the treatment sites, but you will have design control over what data are collected and the agency will back you up on making sure that they are collected regularly.

Kristin, do you want to say more about that?

Kristin Kracke: Just to echo what you said, that -- I mean that that's definitely a lens that we're -- the data collection piece is something that we're studying and I think that the peer review is very strong in reviewing that, and I feel good about -- that we are going to get applicants with strong capabilities in that area.

Operator: Okay, we have one related question.

Sharon Van Der Veer (ph) Hi Katharine, it's Sharon Van Der Veer. We were wondering if there would be -- if all of the children and families involved would be [logged] in the first year or if the program would be adding children and families throughout the four or five years?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Kristin, do you want to speak to that?

Kristin Kracke: I -- they will be adding families over the four years.

Sharon Van Der Veer: Would that -- we are wondering how that would play into our assumption of the 50 kids per site. In other words, would it be 50 at the beginning and possibly grow, or should we assume 50 in total across the entire period?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Oh, yes. Kristin, my read of how that was written is you should anticipate 50 new children coming in every year with a possible 200 by the end of the program.

Kristin Kracke: Per year, yes.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Is that what you anticipate, Kristin?

Kristin Kracke: Well, we asked the sites to propose their service units or the services numbers on a per year basis, so -- like when they propose 30, that's 30 per year.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Right.

Kristin Kracke: So if the average – the assumption is an average of 50 – that would be 200 over the four.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: So that is additive, Sharon.

Sharon Van Der Veer: Okay. And then my understanding is that we would also be expected to follow the kids who come in at the beginning longitudinally, is that correct? Across the four years?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Once you have a comparison or control group in place, you are going to be following those kids but you will never be responsible for following the treatment kids.

Sharon Van Der Veer: Hmm, okay. So that comparison or control kids should be equal to the number of total treatment kids per site.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Well, that's a question of scientific judgment, so I'll rely on you all to propose what science you think is best for determining the size of the comparison or control group.

Sharon Van Der Veer: And can I ask a follow-up question?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Sure.

Sharon Van Der Veer: I am wondering, and I understand this may not be possible for system-wide interventions, but would it be possible to use an experimental design for some of the interventions? In other words, if some sites are – possibly don't have the funding to provide services for all the kids that they identify, that some of those kids could be randomly assigned into our control group.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: We would welcome such an approach where that is feasible. I have read most of the applications from the sites although I am not privy to their rank order right now, so I don't know who is on top. Some sites did propose that they thought a control – a random control design would be feasible for them, and certainly the evaluator can write that into their plans. However, you should know that some sites told us categorically that random assignment was not going to be politically feasible for them, and we are going to abide by their wishes if they feel that their agency cannot handle what they see as a kind of moral quandary around random assignments.

We did our best to talk them out of it but where they told us that that is not a possibility, we are going to respect that and use the ingenuity of our national evaluator to come up with some other way to do it.

Sharon Van Der Veer: Okay.

Operator: Our next question comes from Tammi White. Your question please.

Tammi White: Hi. I just had a quick follow-up clarification on Kimberly's question about the data collection for the control sites. I wasn't sure if I heard it right. The data comes from the sites and goes to OJJDP first or does it come to the national evaluator concurrently?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Well, we're talking about the treatment kids, right?

Tammi White: Yes.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Okay. So, for treatment kids, we have asked the sites to send the data to us first because that is our enforcement mechanism.

Tammi White: Okay.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: They send us this sheet on time and our plans would be to instantaneously turn it over to you; we are not going to hold it for any reason.

Tammi White: Okay. So it would be up the evaluator to clean it and all that; you guys are not doing any quality control on it?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: We are not. However –

Tammi White: Okay.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: They were instructed that the person who is going to have responsibility for collecting data at their site and putting it into a spreadsheet needed to have some – enough familiarity with cleaning and assigning case numbers and so forth, that we would not be getting anything unusable. So they were given standards for what the product is going to look like when it comes to us. So I'm hoping it will not be too burdensome on the national evaluator as that data comes in every six months.

Tammi White: Okay, great. Thank you.

Operator: Our next question comes from Glenda Kaufman-Cantor. Your question please.

Glenda Kaufman-Cantor: I am – this is Glenda. I did have a question about the data that will be collected on the treatment groups. I mean – looking at Appendix D I see that there is a series of largely descriptive variables that – that a site, say, might obtain from a parent or possibly from a clinician. There is nothing in terms of specific measures or nothing gathered from the child, per se; is that correct?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: No, I think we meant for these variables to be data that could be collected from a verbal child but would have to be collected from a parent or clinician where the child was not verbal.

Glenda Kaufman-Cantor: So if the evaluator proposed a design in which he wanted to have additional data, the same kind of data available for both treatment and control, and wanted to have additional data collected that was more sophisticated. I mean – is that within the –

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Absolutely.

Glenda Kaufman-Cantor: Realm of possibility?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: We welcome that but in your proposal we need you to tell us what data – we need you to tell us what data those are and how you propose to collect them, so that we can make a judgment about whether it's something the sites would likely be able to do.

Glenda Kaufman-Cantor: Right, and given the fact that there is a range of –

Katharine Darke Schmitt: That's right.

Glenda Kaufman-Cantor: Ability –

Katharine Darke Schmitt: That's right.

Glenda Kaufman-Cantor: That would be something to keep in mind.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: So if you are proposing something which you feel is fairly sophisticated, you might want to keep that in mind as you address the technical assistance question.

Glenda Kaufman-Cantor: Umhmm. Okay. Thank you.

Operator: Our next question comes from Douglas Wilson. Your question please.

Douglas Wilson: Yes, thank you. Is there going to be an assigned technical assistant – technical assistance contractor?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: No. Kristin, are we still – correct on that?

Kristin Kracke: There will be technical assistance available and provided on a case-by-case task-specific basis but there is not a TA – a dedicated TA provider.

Douglas White: Okay. One of the goals, I would take it, is to have pretty uniform data across all of these sites; is that – am I – given that you've already put out a list of goodies that they should be collecting – am I right about that?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Well, in the best of all possible worlds, I see there being a core set of variables which could be collected across all sites, and I would say that Appendix D represents that sort of minimalist approach to what might possibly be apropos to all sites. As Kristin discussed, we are expecting that when the final 14 sites are selected, what we will wind up with are probably two to four clusters of sites that are doing sort of similar things with sort of similar systemic pathways. And it may be that there are different variables that are more relevant among clusters, in which case perhaps you would not have exactly the same data from every site but, say within a cluster, you would be aiming to collect as much similar data as you could.

Douglas White: So that really goes back, it seems to me, to Dale Parent's question about – comment about the need to, not only look at the evaluability but actually to put these places in clusters, or looking initially for patterns among the sites.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yes, and you will see that one of the responsibilities of the national evaluator listed in the solicitation is an initial process evaluation of the sites, and that is to assure the agency that we know that you know what it is you're looking at.

Douglas White: Okay. This is another question I wanted – that – I want to go beyond this one. The RF – the solicitation says that it is \$1 million, I believe per year, is that correct?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: A million dollars per year for four years with \$500,000 remaining for year five.

Douglas White: So that's \$4.5 million?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Four point five total.

Douglas White: Okay. In doing the – let me go back on the problem which I think has likely concerned a lot of people; the one about the data collection and doing it every six months. My experience on that is letting it go for as long as six months is going to open up some really – is likely to open up some really big gaps that – if places aren't doing it well and so forth, you will – you may have lost a lot of data. And – is there license to do it more often than that?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Your proposal would not be unresponsive if you did propose to collect data more frequently, but keep in mind there is currently no mechanism for forcing the sites to do it more frequently. So if you are proposing that we change the terms at -- for which the sites are anticipating the terms of their contract will be, then the national evaluator is going to have to be prepared to sort of step in there to help.

Douglas White: No, I fully understand that but it – I'll just leave it at that, I guess.

The – my other question is that we're being asked, the national evaluator is being asked, to put together a design for something it doesn't know what it is going to look like. It basically again goes back to Dale's question that, in writing the proposal, you really have very little information to go on with regard to putting together a design. You're going to have to go to paradigms as opposed to a design.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Well, you know the structure that we are looking for and you know from reading the background materials, the types of interventions that we are – and from listening to Kristin, the types of interventions that we are expecting the selected program sites will be implementing. And yes, you're right, this is not a – this is not a solicitation in which we can tell you what the sites are and what they are doing and it was just a question for us of wrestling with: Do we get the evaluator in on the ground floor or do we bring them in afterwards where we can tell them exactly what is going on?

Douglas White: So, to some extent, the evaluator, in proposing a design and the budget, has to understand that there are contingent possibilities?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Oh, absolutely.

Douglas White: All right.

Kristin Kracke: And in the pilot announcement, the solicitation for the pilot -- program side, there is a list in the back of the solicitation, of resources and promising practices that they refer to in terms of evidence based or promising practices that they could build on; so that would be a good list to start –

Douglas White: That was just a list of sites, is my recollection of that.

Kristin Kracke: They are particular program models –

Douglas White: Yes, they are – I agree with that.

Kristin Kracke: But the – so, I guess the key point of that is that the people coming in with the proposals are working in those broad model areas, so they're clustering around those types of program models.

Douglas White: Okay. Okay.

Kristin Kracke: It doesn't narrow it to the degree you are talking about but it at least gives you some idea of – yeah, I mean intervention can be anything; I mean that gives you some kind of sense or nature of the intervention.

Douglas White: Okay, and – I don't know that it said anything in the solicitation but are you expecting site-specific evaluations, outcome evaluations, as opposed to – let's say clusters of sites or something like that? Because the numbers that you are talking about per site may present some needs for ingenuity – I'll put it that -- diplomatically. They will be difficult.

Katherine Darke Schmitt: We have asked for multiple level of analysis including a cross-site comparison of child outcomes, comparison of outcomes for sites with similar interventions –

Douglas White: Okay.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: And data aggregated across all sites. So we want to leave you the latitude to tell us what you can with the data that is available, knowing that there are likely to be some sites

which are either – produce less or are not as reliable in terms of data collection than others, and that therefore there will be some variability in how much one can say about outcomes at a specific site.

- Douglas White: Okay, I understand, thank you.
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Sure.
- Douglas White: Sure.
- Operator: Our next question comes from Cindy Crusto. Your question please.
- Cindy Crusto: I have a question about the \$10,000 allocation to each site. Does this only include resources to collect the data in Appendix C and Appendix D, or is it for the outcome instruments as well?
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: I – Cindy, I'm not sure I understand your question. I think of the data in C and D as being the basis for the outcome data collection.
- Cindy Crusto: I guess in terms of any other additional instruments or resilience instruments –
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Ah, no, resilience – the resilience study is entirely in the province of the evaluator, so it is the national evaluator's budget that needs to cover any additional data collection that you intend – that has to do with the resilience study.
- Cindy Crusto: Okay. So that \$10,000 is only for what is in C and D?
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yes. Cindy, that \$10,000 construct was our attempt to stop the sites from planning expensive local evaluations.
- Cindy Crusto: Okay. And then -- for the treatment or intervention groups, are they going to be assessed at each six-month period as well?
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: That is what the sites had to commit to when they submitted their applications – six-month intervals, and we just – a little earlier, had a discussion about whether this is at all negotiable –
- Cindy Crusto: Umhmm.
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: I think it may be negotiable but it is going to be up to the national evaluator to propose how a site who has only budgeted for twice yearly data collection – how they are going to accomplish more frequent data collection than that.
- Cindy Crusto: And is there any flexibility around the national evaluator's – with collecting data from the intervention or treatment groups?
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Cindy, do you mean: Would you be permitted to go in and collect data from them?
- Cindy Crusto: Yes.
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yes, absolutely you would, and striking the appropriate relationship with the site so that both sides are comfortable with that arrangement will be an important part of the national evaluator's work. Kristin, is that a fair thing to say?
- Kristin Kracke: Umhmm.

- Cindy Crusto: Okay. Thanks.
- Operator: Our next question comes from Alan Bougere. Your question please.
- Alan Bougere: Yes, I'm concerned about baseline; it sounds like some of the sites might be treating children before we have come up with a list of measurements for the sites to measure. Would that just be summary data about what those children are going through until we can get the matched groups, or the control groups, and start doing comparisons that way? And then I – I'll let you answer that question and then I'll do the second one.
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: That question is about the timing of when services might begin, relative to when data collection would begin?
- Alan Bougere: Right.
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Well, we are hoping that we have made this calendar work so that the national evaluator would be onboard and have had a few months with their funds, working on this, before all the sites are up and ready to serve children. In other words, we figure if we have the sites selected this summer, they spend four to six months getting themselves on their feet, organizing themselves, hiring their program directors; the evaluator has that same time to get on its feet and then everybody is ready to go in winter of 05/06. Ideally, that is how it would happen. If something happens and there is a site which is ready to go from Day One and decides to do that, you would have at least this baseline data in the appendices to count on for this first group of children served. It seems logical to me that, when the evaluator was fully ready with developed plans for data collection instruments and so forth, perhaps you would have to start with the second cohort of children served and not the first, if the timing worked out that way and it were not the evaluator's fault.
- Alan Bougere: Of course. And then the second question is: Is the – the four years is – you have got to collect data for four years and the fifth year would be for analyzing and then writing up reports, and that kind of stuff, is that correct?
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: I think that is currently how we envision it; however, as – the agency would like to leave itself some wiggle room.
- Alan Bougere: (Laugh).
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Should we need to extend the period that services are provided and paid for by the government, then we would like the option to extend the time that the evaluator services are provided and paid for by the government as well.
- Alan Bougere: Okay, but the vision right now is the four and one?
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Kristin, are you comfortable with that?
- Kristin Kracke: Yes. I said yeah, did you not hear me? Sorry -- I got lost.
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yes.
- Alan Bougere: Okay, thank you.
- Operator: Our next question is from Dale Parent.
- Dale Parent: My question was answered. I really wanted to know if you're expected to have existing programs or programs that would come in with a very short startup.

- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Dale, I think we are going to perhaps have a mix of both but my suspicion is more of the latter – more of the ones that are going to need some wrap-up time.
- Dale Parent: Okay. The second observation is that – as compared to the level of funding for the demonstration sites, this is considerably smaller, obviously about a third of the amount. Does this contemplate there will be less rigorous start-up activity in terms of the planning work going on in the demonstration sites, or – or are we just talking about a more focused intervention that is looking – a more focused – looking more specifically at certain approaches than was the case originally?
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: My impulse would be to say yes and yes. Kristin, do you want to address that?
- Kristin Kracke: I agree, it's a more focused intervention and – there is a lot broader work that we funded the original demonstration sites to do in terms of systems change, strategic planning, broad scale corroboration across the board continuum. So it's a different effort altogether.
- Dale Parent: All right. One final point: Does that suggest then that these sites will not be – that the 14 sites are not likely to have formal structures in place to provide cross agency collaboration on – on problems that these children face?
- Kristin Kracke: That's correct in the sense that there – it's not a broad collaboration that's in place, or specifically required. However, the coordination aspects in terms of the intersection is necessary for doing a comprehensive intervention. So that is something that the proposals do speak to, and several of the proposals are from applicants that already have some type of children exposure to violence services and efforts already in place in their community. So I think you will find a level of readiness in a few of the selected applicants.
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Kristin, is it fair to say that the applicants under Safe Start Promising Approaches were told that this funding is not for building collaborations, it is for delivering services –
- Kristin Kracke: Correct.
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: And that their proposals, therefore had to show us evidence that their collaboration was in place and largely ready to go if they were selected for funding. Is that correct?
- Kristin Kracke: Correct, but not the broad scale – everybody involved in the continuum that touched the lives of children exposed to violence.
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Right. Okay.
- Dale Parent: So that they're expected to have the capacity to collaborate but they don't have to build that capacity?
- Kristin Kracke: If the intervention issue is mental health and law enforcement, for example, law enforcement and mental health must already have in place an existing agreement. Now, it could be generated in effort – for this particular effort but it needs to be in place as opposed to developed after the award is made.
- Dale Parent: Good. Thanks.
- Kristin Kracke: But it's not the entire universe of children's services agencies in the community.
- Dale Parent: Right.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Which the original Safe Start was, is that correct to say Kristin?

Kristin Kracke: Yeah. That's fair.

Dale Parent: All right, thanks.

Operator: Our next question comes from Tammi White.

Tammi White: Hi. I was just wondering that, in addition to the data you are requesting from the treatment sites in the appendices -- as to whether they are required to report anywhere, information on the children either that weren't accepted into the program or children that dropped out -- can get some kind of sense of the characteristics of the kids who didn't complete, or --

Katharine Darke Schmitt: They are required to collect those data on every child enrolled so we will get data on the non-completers there.

Tammi White: Okay.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Children who were screened and turned away -- I made no provisions for.

Tammi White: Okay. So is there -- so, for example, a child who left in say three months, would they make the next round for the follow up to see if anything else has happened or, once the kid is out of the program, there is no contact, correct?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: I don't know that there's a yes or no answer to that; I think it may vary by site proposal.

Tammi White: Okay.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Because some of them have very brief interventions and some of them had very extended interventions, and so their capacity to be able to follow kids who don't complete is going to be different.

Tammi White: Okay.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yeah, I'm afraid -- I'm afraid we are going to have to deal with the sites on an individual basis -- what they are doing with those particular categories of kids.

Tammi White: Okay. And it would obviously not preclude us from asking them to collect if --

Katharine Darke Schmitt: No.

Tammi White: We're able to -- [go into that]?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yes.

Tammi White: Terrific. Thank you.

Operator: Our next question comes from Jane Grady.

Jane Grady: Whoops, we had the "mute" button on. We have two questions: One on the IRB approval. On page 11 of the solicitation, it had indicated that we should submit provisional clearance from our IRB; and then on page 13 in the footnote it says you don't have to have the IRB clearance at the time of submission. Could you just clarify that a little bit?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yes, most IRBs in my experience, have two levels of approval. One approves a proposal or a concept that is going out to a funder, and the second is the more rigorous review of all the data collection procedures and confidentiality and human protection policies that will be in place. We must see evidence that your IRB has reviewed your proposal and is therefore disposed to review and approve your final project plans. We don't want to be in a situation where you have submitted a proposal and the IRB is not prepared to quickly ratify your design, or perhaps refuses to ratify it because it does not agree with the approach you are taking.

Jane Grady: Okay, thank you. And then one more: On the one-day meeting in DC: Would the national evaluator be responsible for all costs of the participants from the sites as well as the federal agencies – that would be travel and lodging?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yes, all costs for the sites – travel, lodging, logistical arrangements for the meeting; but you will not be responsible for paying for the federal folks who are there.

Jane Grady: Okay, thank you.

Operator: Our next question comes from Douglas Wilson.

Douglas Wilson: I want to go back – thank you. I want to go back to the question that was raised about the follow up. I guess I want some clarification. Are the sites – well, treatment sites – responsible for following up on their cases after they leave the service?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: They are, every six months for four years, but I did not make it explicit with them that they were also going to have to follow up non-completers, so that is why the question about that.

Douglas Wilson: Can you give me the answer again – non-completers --?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Well, the answer was I didn't give the sites specific instructions about following up with non-completers, and – because I didn't mention it explicitly, I think it is probably safe to assume that many sites are going to assume they don't have to follow up non-completers.

Douglas Wilson: Can you define for me what a non-completer might look like?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: A child who was enrolled in a three-month intervention who completes the first month and then never comes back for another appointment.

Douglas Wilson: And that may be a lot of kids.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Could be.

Douglas Wilson: And how are we going to follow up on those? Is that up to the evaluator to worry about that?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: It shouldn't be. The sites were told that they needed to collect information on every child enrolled, every six months; but because I did not explicitly address the issue of children who do not complete, my fear is that they won't have addressed that either in their data collection plans. So we will work with the sites to remind them that their agreement was to collect data on all enrolled children; but I didn't think of addressing this issue specifically when these two solicitations were written. So, it is a grey area right now.

Douglas Wilson: So you will address them to the small print?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yes, the small print, exactly.

- Douglas Wilson: Okay, thank you.
- Operator: Our next question comes from Candice Johnson.
- Candice Johnson: Mr. Wilson just asked my question.
- Operator: Okay. Our next question is from Christine Duclos. Your question please.
- Christine Duclos: Yes, I need to go back to the IRB question. We use our local university's IRB and they do not have a two-step process, plus they charge for any type of review. So I can't get that pre-approval or whatever, without incurring costs; and then they would actually go ahead then with the review. So, in that case, what would we do?
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: As these applications are screened by the Peer Review Committee, the Peer Review has a list of questions about what the required components of the solicitation are and, on that list, will be: Is there evidence that an IRB has reviewed this application? So you will not score any points if they can't check off that box, in that category.
- Christine Duclos: Okay. Because we are dealing with children and families, this will have to go to full committee review?
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Absolutely, yeah.
- Christine Duclos: And so – because of that, that adds a whole other dimension to the application process – of trying to get it reviewed prior to – okay, I guess I'll just have to deal with it.
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: We anticipated that no-one would be ready for a full review prior to the award because it is expensive and cumbersome, and because there may still be details you're working out, and so forth. So that's why we thought the two-stage process would be the best way to go about this, and I hear you saying that, in your case, that is not the best way to go about this; but it is a requirement of the solicitation at this point.
- Christine Duclos: Okay.
- Operator: We have a follow-up question from Douglas Wilson.
- Douglas Wilson: Yes, on that point: IRBs are not noted for their speed.
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Yes.
- Douglas Wilson: And given the short period of putting in this – I guess -- we had about six weeks, something like that – how many points will you lose if you don't do that – if you're unable to accomplish it?
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: If your IRB does not review you -- your proposal at all? You mean, if it comes in –
- Douglas White: Well, suppose you give it to them and they decide that they need a month to review it?
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: Hmm.
- Douglas White: And whatever –
- Katharine Darke Schmitt: And – well, I guess this can't be a point of question to you, Doug, but it would surprise me if the experienced research firms allow proposals out the door without any sort of IRB review, but you are telling me that's possible?

Douglas White: I think it happens a lot.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: All right. Let me look at the point. Let me look at the point assignment and answer that question for you.

Douglas White: Because most of the time the period to put together the proposal plus the fact that people are working on other things, means that, you know, things – time flies.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Of course.

Douglas White: Yes. Even if people are working very hard.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: All right. Then let me do this. I don't think I feel comfortable giving you a categorical answer one way or the other. Kristin and I will discuss this with our human subjects protection officer here on staff at OJJDP and we will post in the FAQ the conclusion that we come to about what to do about this particular issue, which is the provisional IRB review of the proposal.

Douglas White: I appreciate that.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Okay. Kristin, are you okay with that?

Kristin Kracke: Umhmm.

Operator: We have a follow-up question from Glenda Kaufman-Cantor.

Glenda Kaufman-Cantor: I have the same situation. I'm at a university; we need basically a month in advance to schedule a proposal for review, and there is not a [perfect site] provisional two-step process and again, like others, this would require a full board review.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Okay. Then we're hearing a mass growing behind this question and I promise we will address it here with the folks who make decisions about that kind of thing, and we will post a response about how we plan to handle this particular issue on the FAQ and we will do that before the next conference call which is scheduled for May 5.

Glenda Kaufman-Cantor: Okay, that would be great, it would be very helpful.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Sure.

Operator: We have another follow-up question from Jane Grady.

Jane Grady: Yes, we just wanted to weigh in – we are also from a university and there is no provisional, it's all or nothing; and again, like the other people who have mentioned – it would take over a month.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Okay, thanks Jane.

Operator: There are no further questions at this time.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: All right. Tanya, would you call one more time for last questions before I do a wrap up.

Operator: Our next question comes from Kimberly Kendziora. Your question please.

Kimberly Kendziora: Just a really simple technical question – around registering for the electronic submission or registering – whatever that registration is –

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Right.

Kimberly Kendziora: I guess – does – if one organization is partnering with another organization, does everybody need to register or just the prime?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Just the prime needs to register.

Kimberly Kendziora: Thank you.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Sure.

Operator: Our next question comes from Frances Gragg. Your question please.

Frances Gragg: Hi. Just – I'm sorry to beat a dead horse, buys. Page 17 of the site, program announcements are – it says: "Children [needing] or [seeking] services should receive the follow up semi-annually for 24 months after the intervention." Is that the initiation of the intervention?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: It was our intention that that be intake, yes.

Frances Gragg: Okay, so it's after the intake. So, is – are there any sites that would be carrying on the – Kristin – no, not Kristin, I'm sorry – Katharine, I believe, just said they would be followed up for the duration of their participation. So, if they were in the system, if they were some of the first people in and – maybe they were in counseling for three years; would they continue to be followed or would it end after 24 months?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Our goal is to use the first two years of the program to observe how the sites are doing at cycling kids in and through. The sites who are doing really well and collecting good data – we will make sure that they continue to collect follow-up data beyond the 24 months. However, we recognize that some states -- some sites may not be as strong so it is possible we would have a smaller sample of follow-up data collected from sites who are chronically struggling with retention issues.

Frances Gragg: So that it's possible that our numbers would reach from 14 to a lesser, a sub-sample of some sort?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: It is possible; that is one of the – yes, in the out years of this evaluation, as you can tell from this discussion with us, there are many parameters that are going to be negotiated to make sure we are getting the best use out of the best data that we have. We don't want to be throwing dollars at evaluating sites which are just not giving us useful data, and we don't want to miss anything from the sites that are doing a really good job. So we will look forward, in our relationship with the sites and the national evaluator at – letting this organism which is a national evaluation – develop into the strongest possible system and, if that requires some re-thinking at year two, then we will do that, with the full participation and collaboration of everyone who is involved.

Frances Gragg: Okay, thanks. I appreciate that.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Sure.

Operator: Our next question is from Christine Duclos.

Christine Duclos: Hi. Getting back to the IRB, it just dawned on me that we have 14 sites. Are you going to require local IRB review as well as a national IRB review?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: Each site had to submit plans for clearing their service delivery and data collection with their own IRB, yes.

Christine Duclos: Okay. And it will be their responsibility?

Katharine Darke Schmitt: It is their responsibility because they have to have cleared that they are sending out OJJDP data on – case level data on individual kids, yes, that is their responsibility.

Christine Duclos: Okay, because if you are going to get some tribal sites which I have worked in, the IHS has their own review which is a national as well as a regional; which takes forever.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: That's good to know, thanks for the heads up --

Christine Duclos: Okay.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: That's a possibility.

Christine Duclos: Okay.

Operator: I am showing no further questions.

Katharine Darke Schmitt: All right folks, thank you so much for your time this afternoon. We enjoyed having the chance to discuss this solicitation with you. We will address some of the questions that were raised in the discussion today, in the frequently asked questions document and we will make a specific point of addressing the IRB question in the frequently addressed questions document which will be revised and re-posted before our next conference call, which will be May 5, again at 3:00 pm.

You are absolutely welcome to participate in the second call if you want to hear this again or if you would like to ask more questions. The agenda for the call will be the same; however, we do occasionally get new questions the second time; we didn't have the first time. There will be a transcript prepared of this call, which will be posted on the website where the funding information is, and I also want to remind you that if you have questions about preparing your proposal, you may call: 202-305-9234, leave us a voice mail with your name, phone number and question, and then we will return your call promptly to help you sort out application issues.

Please remember that May 2nd is the registration deadline on GMS. If you are not registered on May 2nd in GMS, you will not be permitted to submit an application, and that is even if you were part of this conference call or if we have subsequent conversations with you because you call that 305 number. Please make sure you are registered; there is no mechanism to make an exception. The day the proposals are due, yours will not be accepted by the system if there is not a valid registration. So make sure you have attended to those directions carefully.

Likewise, the solicitation closes at 8:00 pm Eastern Time on June 7th, and there can be no exceptions to that. Please know – anticipate that around the 7th the system itself gets busy; the help desk telephone line as -- folks who answer questions about GMS gets very busy, and there are times when those two systems respond very slowly. We need to set a deadline for the solicitation and we will not make an exception because either GMS was slow on the evening of the 7th or because the help line could not address your question in time, on the 7th. So please be aware of that and prepare your applications in time – that you have a comfortable margin.

Kristin and I thank you very much for your participation. We cannot discuss with you individually, by our personal phones or voice mails, this solicitation; so please use that telephone number that takes the voice mails, if you need to communicate with us.

Tanya, thank you very much for your help.

Everyone: Good luck with your applications and we will look forward to hearing from you or seeing your applications later in the spring. Thank you.

Operator: Thank you ladies and gentlemen; you may all disconnect and have a wonderful day.