

Peer Review Plan

Title of Review: Revised Study Plan **Influential Scientific Information**

Agency: FNS **Highly Influential Scientific Assessment**

Agency Contact: Rich Lucas

Subject of Review: Survey of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and Work

Purpose of Review: Subject revised study plan to formal, independent, external peer review to ensure that the data collection and analysis protocols will result in high quality data and objective findings.

Type of Review: Panel Review Individual Reviewers
 Alternative Process (Briefly Explain):

Timing of Review (Est.): Start: 11/2017 End: 1/2018 Completed: 1/2018

Number of Reviewers: 3 or fewer 4 to 10 More than 10

Primary Disciplines/Types of Expertise Needed for Review: _____
There are three areas of expertise needed: (1) research methodology and statistical analysis; (2) knowledge of SNAP and SNAP Employment and Training; and (3) knowledge of Workforce research

Reviewers selected by: Agency Designated Outside Organization
Organization's Name: Westat, Inc.

Opportunities for Public Comment? Yes No

If yes, briefly state how and when these opportunities will be provided:
How: _____
When: _____

Peer Reviewers Provided with Public Comments? Yes No

Public Nominations Requested for Review Panel? Yes No

Other: _____



The reviewers will be charged with two tasks as follows:

1. Review of the revised study plan to determine if the proposed sampling plan, data collection methods and content/topic areas for the survey instrument were appropriate for obtaining the data required for addressing all the study objectives. This task has been completed. The contractor prepared a memo summarizing peer reviewers' recommendations and whether and how each recommendation was incorporated in the final study plan.
2. Review of the draft final report to determine if the analyses were robust and thoroughly address each of the research objectives, whether the analyses support the interpretation, and the extent to which the conclusions follow from the analysis, and the strengths and limitations of the overall conclusions. The peer reviewers will be requested, as appropriate, to suggest ways to clarify assumptions, findings, and conclusions; identify oversights, omissions, and inconsistencies; and, if needed, encourage authors to more fully acknowledge limitations and uncertainties.

All peer reviewers will be informed that the Agency does not have funds to make changes that require additional data collection, reconsideration of the research design, or significant modifications to data collection and analysis methods. The reviewers will be informed that the Agency, while it will welcome recommendations that may improve the design of other FNS studies, requires an evaluation of the current product that is cognizant of the funding constraints.

Each reviewer will be asked to provide a written review of the draft final report and participate in a meeting with FNS and the contractor to discuss comments and recommendations for revising the report. Because this study is considered influential scientific information, reviewers will be informed that the Agency is required to make available to the public the written charge to the peer reviewers, the peer reviewers' names, and the peer reviewers' comments documented in a memorandum prepared by the contractor. This memorandum will also document how the contractor addressed the peer reviewers' comments in the revised report submitted to FNS for review.