

Mathematica Policy Research
2014-10-28 12_1

Hi everyone. We're going to get started. As I mentioned, all of your lines are muted right now. At the end of the webinar we will unmute selected lines if people have questions. If you haven't already entered the audio PIN that was provided to you, please enter that during the call if you'd like to be able to ask a question live through the phone lines. If you need to find your audio PIN, you can click on your name on the webinar window and it will provide you the audio PIN to enter in your phone. If you've called into the voice-over IP you don't need the audio PIN.

If you have any questions during the webinar, you can also type them into the questions box. We'll hold those questions until the end and then we'll field those. So, again, I'm Jean Knab and welcome everyone. We're going to be doing a brief refresher today on the evaluation final report template that we presented to you in June. We'll give you a brief overview of the template and really try to focus on some of the updates to the template since the June conference and some questions we've received about the template since the conference. Then we'll provide you an opportunity to ask more questions, as we expect many of you have started working on your final reports, since the first ones will start rolling in in February.

I should mention that this final report template is the approved template for the OAH grantees. For the FYSB grantees, if any of you are listening, FYSB is still considering the final report template that they'd like for you. So we're hoping to have some news for you in the near future on that. So without further ado, I will turn it over to Cay Bradley who will be doing the presentation. Cay.

Thanks, Jean. So good afternoon, and as Jean said, thank you all for joining us. This webinar is an update of a presentation that I had made at the June 2014 conference, so if you have moments of déjà vu, don't worry, that's to be expected. The focus today, as Jean mentioned, is on the final evaluation report template for the OAH grantees, and as she mentioned, FYSB is still working out there final guidance, and that will be forthcoming.

This presentation, the recording of this presentation, the conference presentation slides, and some examples that I'll refer to this in this presentation will all be posted to the SharePoint site.

So my goal today is to present on four different things. First of all, to remind you of the final evaluation reporting requirements; second, to highlight changes to the template that we've made since June; third, to familiarize you with assets of the template, both old and new elements; and finally, I'm hoping to still have some time for questions at the end for all of you.

Before we dive too deep into the template though, I want to make sure is that we're all using two important phrases in the same way, and that's benchmark analysis and sensitivity analyses. So the benchmark analysis is the key analysis for the story that you're going to tell in your final evaluation report. It should be the analysis that is of interest to the HHS evidence review. Sensitivity analyses, or sometimes called supplemental analyses, involve changing one aspect of the benchmark analysis.

So, some examples are, if you are an RCT, or a randomized control trial, with high attrition, you're going to want to present a benchmark analysis where you've used some sort of matching mechanism in order to ensure that you have equivalence between your intervention and comparison group so that you're eligible for the highest possible rating of that type of study in the HHS evidence review. That means that your intent to treat analysis will actually be a sensitivity analysis, and it will be included in the appendix.

Another analysis that would be a sensitivity analysis, for many of you, is going to be analyses where you imputed outcome or covariate data. And finally, some of you have proposed analyses where you've defined an outcome slightly differently in your supplemental analyses, and, again, those would be considered sensitivity analyses and would be presented in the appendix.

So, remember that your final evaluation report is not your final grant write-up. There will be a grant wrap-up report that you'll have to submit as well, but that is not your final evaluation report. The goal of the final evaluation report is to present a study's impact with documentation so that the reader understands what

Mathematica Policy Research
2014-10-28 12_1

you found and under what conditions. This is not a report of everything that happened in the course of your five-year grant. It's simply the impact story that you're trying to tell.

The other thing to remember is that your final evaluation report is similar to a journal article in that it should be concise, and it also needs to be accessible to a broad audience of readers, some of whom may be nontechnical. So you want to make sure that you're not talking in too much research jargon. The reports will be made publicly available, in addition to being submitted to the HHS pregnancy prevention evidence review.

The other thing to remember -- and I'm going to remind you of this a few times -- that the final evaluation report is not your only venue for presenting your findings, nor is it the only product that OAH is expecting to come out of your grant. So we recognize that some of you have interesting questions that you want to look at that are not a part of the HHS evidence review necessarily. That's fine. They just shouldn't be in this particular final evaluation report.

I want to remind you about perspective, which we talked about at the conference as well. To date, most of your OAH documents have been written for people you know, for your liaison and for your project officer who've been involved with your project over time. Your final evaluation report, however, should be written for people who have not been on your regular calls with your TA liaison and your project officer, and so it's important that you orient them to your story. They're not going to know why you chose the intervention you chose or the population you chose, and also, how it's connected to the larger effort that is funded by OAH and FYSB.

You want to make sure that it's easy to follow the story that you're telling in your final evaluation report, and we focus the template on four key questions; what were you looking at, what programming was intended, and what programming was actually provided; how did you look at impacts and what did you find. Again, remember, this is not going to be your only publication; this is simply your final evaluation report that's being submitted to OAH and to the evidence review.

Before we start talking about details, I just want to give you all a summary of what's different between the June 2014 draft and the final reporting templates so that you guys know what to look for in case you've been focused on the draft template for a while. First of all, we did deliver, as we promised, the table shells, and instructions on how to complete those table shells. So you'll see those in your evaluation template. We've also expanded the appendices. It's important to know that not all of the appendices will be required, and I'll talk more about that in a moment. And in many cases, we've actually provided table shells and instructions there as well to help you with your appendices.

We've changed where we would like you to report the intent to treat or ITT analyses for the RCTs with high attrition. Those should be presented in the appendix as a sensitivity analysis, and then that matching analysis, which will hopefully meet the HHS pregnancy prevention evidence review standards, should appear in the main body. That should be your benchmark analysis.

We want to remind you that analyses with imputed data are not benchmark analyses if you are an RCT with high attrition or a study that used a quasi experimental design, and we've also provided suggestions for the presentations of findings where multiple comparison adjustment are needed.

So this slide should be familiar. It is both part of the template, which hopefully you have looked at, and it is also one of the slides that I used in the conference presentation. As we talked about at the conference presentation, we have provided a brief annotated outline of the report content, and in the annotated report, what we've done is, underneath each section heading, we've included tables that have particular pieces of information. So you can see here that we're looking at section one, the introduction, and we've indicated that this should be approximately two pages, which reminds me, remember, your final evaluation report should be about 20 pages. We have provided page length suggestions. These are not requirements, and some of you may need to shift things around a little bit.

Underneath introduction, you can see that the first part is the introduction and study overview, and here we've talked about the purpose, the instructions and reminders related to this section, potential sources for writing the section, and also whether or not there are non-text elements that should be included. Part of the reason we did this is as a table is so it's easy for you all to use the annotated outline to draft your report, and you can just delete a table as you move through it.

So here is another example. This is from section three, the baseline equivalence. Again, this should look vaguely familiar, because we talked about this one in the conference presentation as well. You can see here that it's got a table underneath it, which describes the purpose, which is to provide information on how baseline equivalence was assessed for the analytic samples. It also gives you instructions and reminders, so, for example, in this case, we've reminded you that you're going to have to do this for each sample that's being used to answer a primary or secondary research question. So you can see in the second paragraph in the instructions and reminders, we've outlined that and described what we're talking about specifically.

You'll notice here that the non-text elements have actually changed. It references the fact that there's actually a landscape table shell for a table 3.3, which will be used to demonstrate equivalence. And we note that baseline equivalence tables are required, so that means we're expecting to see a Table 3.3.

We've also provided table instructions any time we have provided a table shell for you. You can see we have tried to make these instructions very clear. So we, again, remind you about the purpose of the table. So in this case the purpose of the table is to demonstrate equivalence between groups on key baseline characteristics. We've given you some information on how to use the table; for example, we say here that you're going to have to copy and paste this table, so there's one table for each analytic sample in the report, and we have just noticed that an analytic sample is described as the sample in which effects are estimated. So we have reiterated again that you're going to do this. If you're looking at six-month follow up and 12-month follow up, you're going to have two different baseline equivalence tables.

We've also indicated what you should be replacing in the table, so, for example, we have a placeholder for the survey name, and you would replace that with a particular time point survey. So you would want it to read "Summary statistics of key baseline measures for youth completing the six-month follow-up survey," and I'll show you the table in just a moment.

We've also indicated, you know, if you're got additional measures, then you should be adding rows, and we've tried to give you information about exactly what we're expecting in each column or row. So here is the table shell that we have developed in order to demonstrate equivalence. You can see it's the summary statistic of key baseline measures for youth completing, and then it's the survey name, so that's what you're going to tell us exactly what time point it is.

You can see that we have intervention and comparison columns, and then we also have the intervention versus comparison column, which is where you're going to report the mean difference, and also the P-value of that difference. And, again, these baseline measures should be very familiar to you. They're the ones you all have been reporting on all along. And at the very bottom you can see we've asked you to report your sample size for your group as well.

So now I want to talk about appendices for a moment. We recognize that all of the reports are probably going to differ with respect to appendices. Not all of you are going to need all of the same appendices, and the appendices really should be additional information that supports your story but is not central to your story. We identified seven possible appendices and we've generated templates for five of those seven appendices. So, for example, we thought that some of you may want to include a logic model for your program, so that might be an appendix that you put in. Some of you have complicated data collections and so you might want to actually have an appendix where you're presenting the data collection timing so that the reader understands exactly when you were collecting what data from people. So that's Appendix A.

Appendix B is the implementation data collection. Again, some of you have complicated implementation data collection efforts, and so it may be easier to put that in a table so the reader sees it quickly. One appendix that is required of all grantees is the sample flow. This is currently identified as Appendix C, and I'll show you this in just a moment. You may also want to have a table about your implementation data methods. Some of you remember doing these tables as part of your implementation analysis plans, and you'll notice when you look at it, that Appendix B and Appendix D look very similar to what you were working on in your implementation analysis plans. Appendix E is for sensitivity analyses, and we've reminded you here that this would be the ITT estimates for an RCT with high attrition.

We also recognize that some of you like equations and like Greek letters, so you may want to put your model specifications or equations for the baseline equivalence and/or program impacts. Again, those should be in the appendix not in the main body of the report. Some of you may also want to describe the methods that you use to clean and prepare your data. Again, that should be in your appendix, not in your main story. And finally, some of you may also want to provide detail-descriptions of methods that are used to analyze implementation data. And, again, while we recognize that's important information for people to understand, it's not necessarily central to your story, so we'd like you to have that in an appendix, not as a part of the body of your report.

This is what Appendix C, the study sample table, looks like. You'll notice that this particular one that I've got up here is for a cluster design, so there's a top part of the table, which is about the number of clusters. And you'll see that you're putting in the number of clusters at the beginning of the study and then the number of clusters who contributed at least one youth at baseline, the number that contributed at least one youth at follow up, and then immediate post-programming follow up, and then in row four, contributed at least one youth at follow up at six months post-programming survey, and finally, in row five, contributed at least one youth at follow up at the 12-month post programming survey.

If we stay up in that top part about number of clusters, you can also see that we've used a combination of numbers and letters in order to make sure that everybody is calculating things the way that we were anticipating, because, remember, part of the reason for this report is so that there's some consistency in the reports, and also to feed into the HHS evidence review. So, although I know all of you can calculate response rates, we have still just taken this precautionary step and made sure that everybody understands exactly what numbers we're expecting to be where.

So if we focus on row two in the number of clusters, you can see that the total sample size is designated by the number two, and it's equal to the sum of 2A plus 2B, and 2A is the intervention sample size for the number of clusters that contributed at least one youth at baseline, and 2B is the same thing for the comparison sample size.

The total response rate is equal to two, which is the total sample size who contributed at least one youth at baseline, divided by one, which is the number of clusters -- the total number of clusters at the beginning of the study. So, again, we've gone to this level of detail just so you guys can see exactly how we were expecting things to be calculated.

The bottom part of this table is about the number of youth or sub-cluster units, and you'll notice that we have made it very clear, because we've highlighted in the template, that in row six you're talking about the number of youth in non-attributing clusters or sites at the time of assignment. So, remember, we've talked about the fact that for the HHS evidence review, when they calculate attrition, if you are a cluster study, they do not include in the denominator the number of youth who were in the clusters that attrited, and so that's why we want to make sure that know that row six is about the non-attributing clusters.

You'll see here that we also wrote them as who consented. This is important because some people have done consent after assignment, and so it's important to be able to document who consented. Row 6 is about the number of youth who contributed to baseline survey, and then rows 9 through 11, just like the rows up above in the cluster, are about the number who contributed follow-up surveys immediately post-programming, 6 months post-programming, and 12 months post-programming.

Mathematica Policy Research
2014-10-28 12_1

In a very similar fashion, you'll see that each cell is represented either by a number and a letter, if it is a value that you'll be entering, or by a formula that references those numbers and letters, those cells that you'll be using to do your calculations.

So here is an example of a completed Appendix C, and we will post the full example of this table and also the related consort diagram. All of you have been doing CONSORT diagrams as a part of your biannual reporting, and we actually have a CONSORT diagram and an Appendix C table that you can see how we map things together. Those will be posted on SharePoint with this presentation.

So in this particular table, you can see that they started off with 20 intervention clusters and 20 comparison clusters, so for a total of 40. They collected baseline in every cluster, so they have a hundred-percent response rate, both total and for both the intervention and comparison group. They did not administer an immediate post-program survey, so they've just put NA in that row. And then at the six months post-programming, they actually lost one of their intervention clusters. You can see they have 19, where before they had 20. And so that means the total response rate is a 97.5 with a 95% response rate in the intervention and a hundred percent in the comparison.

And moving down, you can see that at the 12-month post-programming they did not regain their lost intervention cluster, which is not surprising. However, they did lose four comparison clusters, so you can see here that they have 16 comparison clusters at that point, and that gives them a total response rate of 87.5. The response rate for the intervention group is still 95, because they didn't lose any additional clusters, and the response rate for the comparison group is 80%.

Down below we have the number of youth, and in their intervention sample size, they had 2,218 youth. This is excluding the number of youth who attended the cluster that was lost, and similarly, in the comparison group they have 2,039 youth. Again, this is not including the youth who were in those four clusters who attrited from the study. And as you can see, they've moved through and they've put in their numbers for who consented, who completed baseline, and they've calculated the response rates.

This slide should look vaguely familiar as well. We talked about expectations at the conference. We just want to make sure that everybody understands what's going on. We expect each grantee to submit the draft report by the date that was agreed upon. For the OAH grantees, that date was in your NCE letter, and we have also confirmed it or in the process of conferring it with you.

You should also reach out to the liaison and project officer if you realize something needs to change. We know that, as you work on the analyses, you may want to deviate from what's on record in your impact analysis plan or your implementation analysis plan, or in the letter itself, and if that's the case, just make sure you talk to your FPO, your project officer, and also your liaison sooner rather than later. You will also need to document those deviations from those plans and submit them as a cover memo with your report so that everybody understands where and why you had deviated from what had been originally agreed upon.

The review process is going to be very similar to the impact analysis plan. It's going to be an iterative process, with memos and revisions. We're anticipating a three to six month review process. At least two people will read the reports, and one of those people will be a cold read. They will not have been involved with any of the previous reviews of your impact or implementation analysis plans. They will not be a former liaison for you. They'll be a cold read.

The other thing to know is you may get feedback on any aspect of the report, so you could get feedback about the analysis or how you've handled something. You could also get feedback about clarity of language. The purpose of the review is really to ensure that you all have the strongest possible report.

So, for next steps, your liaison should have been reaching out to you confirm final report dates and the content of the final report with you if you are an OAH grantee this month. So hopefully all of you have either done that or will hear from your liaison shortly. You should reach out to your Mathematica liaison if you have any questions about the template, and they will make sure that they get you an answer, either

by reaching back to Jean and Russ about the template or they may be able to give you the answer without going back to Jean and Russ.

We also want to make sure that you know we are encouraging you to begin writing sections of the final report even before data collection is complete. For example, the introduction, the programming, comparison programming, even some assets of the study design, you could be work on those right now. We also encourage you to clean the data and build analytic models and run the models with the data that you have in hand. Some of you have a very short window between when your data collection ends and when your report is due, and so we just want to make sure that you're aware that you can get started sooner rather than later, and we do recommend that in order to make sure that you'll be able to submit your report on -- your draft report on the date that everybody agreed to. As I said, please make sure you keep your project officer and liaison informed about your progress, any questions or potential changes to either the impact or the implementation analysis plans.

So before we open it up to questions, I do want to share with you four questions that we've received from a number of people over the course of the last few months. So, first of all, as I said, the final report is supposed to be 20 pages. You can change the section page lengths. You know, your introduction does not need to be two pages for example, but the 20 pages is a definite limit. So stay within 20 pages, but if you need to shift things around a little bit that's Okay.

The other thing is, you do not need to title your final report impact evaluation of your grantee program in your location. You should use a title that resonates with you. As I said earlier, you don't need to do all seven appendices, only Appendix C, which is the sample flow table, is required, the other appendices are there because we recognize that some of you may need those, and we've tried to give you the support in order to help you complete those appendices.

And finally, we have been asked whether or not a study that has low attrition as a unit of assignment -- so this is an RCT with low attrition -- whether or not they need to demonstrate baseline equivalence. We are saying, yes, it's not required in order to meet the HHS evidence review standards; however, it is going to help your reader understand the sample. We do want to point out that even if you have low attrition, there could be chance differences between the two groups in the analytic sample, and if those are statistically significant differences, then your analysis needs to control for those variables.

So that's all I have, so Jean, and Russ, I'm going to turn this back to you for questions from the audience.

Great. Thank you, Cay. And just to follow up on that the evaluation title, we are asking people to keep that formulaic title for the abstract. All the abstracts will be located centrally on the OAH website. But then when you're translating it to the final report, the final report doesn't have to have that same title in that format.

And before we move on to questions, I just want to apologize. It has come to my attention that there were two different times indicated for the start of this webinar. In one place it said 1:00 o'clock, in one place it said 12:30. We were surprised at how prompt everyone was for the webinar, so I apologize. The intended start time was 1:00 o'clock, and we'll make sure that doesn't happen again.

So it looks like right now we have one question that was submitted through the chat box. I don't see any hands raised. So please send in any questions that you have, or raise your hand if you'd like us to open your line.

This question says, "Does OAH publishing the report limit submission to some journals, which require that the study will not be published elsewhere?" So OAH, I don't believe -- and I'll let Amy Farb respond in a moment -- to my knowledge OAH hasn't decided exactly what will happen with these. They will be submitted to the evidence review, and for that they have to be publicly available. But I believe there has been no determination yet as to whether these will all be publicly posted on the OAH website, which could potentially have implications for some journals.

Can we open Amy's Farb's line and see if she had anything to add on that. Amy, did you have anything to add on that?

Hey, Jean, can you hear me?

Yes.

Okay, good. Our plan at OAH actually is we are going to post them on the OAH website. So I think the question had to do with because they actually wanted to publish then in journals. If people want to go publish them in journals, then we're happy to take them down off of our website if we have to: My guess is probably what would be published would look a little different than what we are asking for here. But if asked to, we could pull it down in anticipation of a journal publication. But, yes, we'll make all of these publicly available, you know, and then there they're submitted to evidence review, as Jean said, and they have to be made publicly available there, and the version that was reviewed for the evidence review, so.

Okay. So any of you who are, you know, going to attempt to publish in one of the journals that has very strict guidelines on where the paper has been located in the past, like it can't be part of a working paper series of something like that, if you anticipate a problem, please reach out to your federal project officer sooner rather than later on that issue.

Okay, there's another question indicating that there are several iterations in the review and feedback on the final evaluation. Is this the last possible exchange -- is the last possible exchange or discussion August 29, 2015, the end of the grant period? So that is going to be specific to your situation and your grant. You should just reach out to your project officer and to your TA liaison. Everybody is on a different schedule. We're going to have reports rolling in from February through, I believe, the following November. Some of that's going to be contingent on when your timelines are, when your grant is going to end, whether you're getting an extension. So I would raise that on a case-by-case basis.

Okay, the next question was, "Are all appendices and sensitivity analyses going to be posted on the website along with the paper?" Amy, do you want to speak to that? Are those going to be available upon request, or will they will just be automatically posted? I don't know if you've thought at that level of detail yet.

Our plan at this point is to turn everything into PDFs and post them on the website.

Okay. Including the appendices?

Yes. So whatever comes in as part of the report that we've asked for will be PDFs made 508 compliant, posted on the website.

Okay. And just to follow up on that, so as Cay indicated, we put down a list of the possible appendices you might want to do. That does not mean that everybody should have each of those. They're not required. I believe there's only one required appendix. We were just trying to be thinking about the things that you might want to cover and give some guidance about how to do that, parsimoniously, so that, the appendices are tight and really just some key supplemental information. But everyone should not feel like they have to hit all those points and have very lengthy appendices.

All right, I think Russ is going to take the next one.

Sure. Thanks, Jean. So we have a question that says, "How do you report equivalence adjustments to propensity scoring in the report?" And so we discussed propensity score matching as a means to achieve a baseline equivalence sample during the June meeting. And there's a brief that is in the final stages of production that will kind of lay out the same topics that we discussed during that June meeting. The general approach here -- excuse me, it sounds like I'm a little garbled. I'm just going to say that all one more time. I apologize.

Mathematica Policy Research
2014-10-28 12_1

We laid out an approach for propensity score matching during the June meeting with the grantees, and we have a brief that's in the final stages of production that's going to provide a similar level of detail as what was presented during June. The general idea is that a propensity score matching approach is a means to get an equivalence sample, and the key feature of the propensity score matching approach is to demonstrate that the final matched sample is equivalent on the key variables required for the evidence review at baseline.

So, that is to say, the baseline equivalence demonstration for propensity score matching approach is no different than the baseline equivalence demonstration for either an RCT or a QED. The one piece of information that will be required is an articulation of the propensity matching approach that ultimately produced that matched sample. So you'll see a fair amount of detail in this in the matching brief that will be coming out shortly, and, again, if you're curious about the details, they're also in the slides that were presented back in June.

So someone had a question about when they will receive more information on the final wrap-up report, which, from their understanding, is different from the final impact evaluation report. Amy, do you want to talk about sort of the grant requirements -- the grant report requirements versus sort of the impact evaluation requirements?

Sure. Unfortunately I don't know much about the final grant requirement, other than it's something separate. It should be in your terms and conditions for the fifth year, and I would just hold tight. I'm sure you'll be getting more information about that from the program side. I'll let Amy Margolis know that that came up today and try get some information out to everybody. But it is separate.

All right, those are the only questions we've received electronically, and at the moment, we don't see any hands raised. Unfortunately, we don't have the ability to open all the lines universally to ask questions, so if you have a question, you have to let us know through this system so that we can answer it. Okay, it doesn't look like there are any additional questions at this time. Of course, if you have any questions at any time, you can...

There's one here.

Oops. Okay, one moment. But at any time, you can, of course, ask your TA liaison. You can also reach out to Cay or Russ or I, and we will answer those as well. So we have a hand raised. Can we unmute Matilda. Okay, Matilda, you're unmuted. Did you have a question?

Yeah. Can we have -- I'm having difficulty accessing the SharePoint? Is there a way to make it -- I don't know what we can do. I've been trying.

You want to be able to access the slides in SharePoint.

Yeah. I'm having difficulty accessing.

Oh, oh, just accessing SharePoint in general?

Yes.

Okay. We'll follow up with you separately on that, absolute. I'll have Lauren follow up with you, and we'll make sure that you get copies of everything that you need and see if we can troubleshoot your specific problem.

Thank you.

Sure. Okay. All right, if there are no other questions, I just wanted to put in a plug for your next webinar, that will be conducted by communication staff at Mathematica. It will actually be a webinar that's appropriate for the program folks and the evaluators, and it will be on how to get your message out,

Mathematica Policy Research
2014-10-28 12_1

dissemination efforts, both in terms of thinking about how to craft your message and tools that you can use to disseminate your message, and then really importantly, for those of us who are evaluators, how to figure out if that message is getting out there, and then how to tweak your dissemination model as a result of that. So right now, that is scheduled for November 12th at 3:00 o'clock Eastern, and you'll be getting an invitation for that later today through the SharePoint system.

All right, well thank you everyone for participating and we will be posting copies of all this material, as well as the recording, on SharePoint for you, in case you want to hear it again or for anybody who wasn't able to attend.