Transcript of January 29, 2014 Webinar

Hi, everyone. This is Jean Knab at Mathematica Policy Research. Welcome everyone to the webinar. I'm going to start with a few housekeeping announcements. First, all of your lines are muted in the interest of reducing static and feedback on the call. If you have questions during the presentation, you should feel free to type them into the question section of the GoTo Webinar software, and we'll open some lines at the end to see if there are any additional questions. Of course, at any time you have questions, you should feel free to reach out to your TA liaison, to your project officer, and we also have at the end of this webinar the contact information for the folks that are leading each of these efforts, and you should feel free to reach out to them as well.

You should have received a Share Point alert for links to the documents that we're going to be talking about today. All of the templates and guidance that we'll be talking about today are on the TPP website, and you should also be receiving copies of the guidance from your project officers.

I want to take a minute to introduce the team as we've had some changes to the team associated with the new evaluation technical assistance contract that was awarded this fall. Many of you know me, I'm Jean Knab. I was the Deputy Project Director on the last contract and I'll be serving as the Project Director on this contract. Susan Zief, who was our Project Director on the last contract, will remain involved with this contract and she remains a TA liaison. Russell Cole who was the PI on the prior contract, will be the Deputy Project Director on this contract. Lauren Murphy, who many of you have interacted with on Share Point management, will remain on the contract, but Seth Chizeck now oversees Share Point. So if you run into any issues, you can get in touch with him.

Several other members of the team are going to be talking today. Juliette Henke, who is a TA liaison, is going to be talking about the evaluation progress report and some changes that we're making to try to tailor those assessments to your particular evaluations. Subuhi Asheer, who has been working very closely with Jacqueline Berman, is going to present a new reporting requirement, the implementation analysis plan template. And Russ Cole is going to talk about the evaluation abstract templates that we're going to have you fill out. And then he's also going to go over the timing and the process for all the reporting requirements. And then we'll go over any questions that you have.

We recognize that this is a lot of new reporting this time around. We've done a lot to try to minimize the amount of information that we're asking for, really try to build on other things that you've already provided to us, including the analysis plans. These reports will also help you build for the future and for the final evaluation report. We're hoping that all these pieces that you've been putting together really then make the final reporting that you will have to do in your last contract year very straightforward.

I just want to take a minute and see if Amy Farb had anything she wanted to add at this time?

Thanks, Jean. Hi, everybody. This is Amy Farb, the Evaluation Specialist at OAH. And this is our first webinar since the Evaluation Training and Technical Assistance contract was re-competed this past fall, as Jean said. And we're really pleased here at OAH and at FYSB that Mathematica won the contract again and will continue to support OAH and FYSB and all of you. This new five-year contract is going to see you all through the end of your current grants. So as we move into the last 18 months or so of your grants, we are focused on the completion of your evaluation, and eventually the End of Grant report, which is an evaluation report. So from here on, the evaluation reporting requirements are all geared towards helping you produce that evaluation report.

So we have some new reporting due at the end of March, which will go through review and comment by Mathematica and is going to require some revisions by you all. And while it may seem as if we're asking a lot of you over the next few months, our intention is to actually make things easier for you over time. So we hope that you'll be able to quickly produce the evaluation report at the end of these grants, or even earlier if at all possible. So all the reporting we're asking you for directly feeds into that report.

Your evaluation reports are not only a requirement of the grant, but they're also going to be fed into the HHS Pregnancy Prevention Evidence Review. So we're hoping that many of your reports are going to inform the Evidence Review and may even inform our next TPP grant cycle. So they're very, very

important to OAH and to FYSB. But it's also more important now than ever that you meet all evaluation reporting deadlines. All reporting goes to Mathematica and is reviewed under the Eval TA contract, and we've set up windows for these reviews. So if reporting deadlines aren't met by the grants, it causes a ripple effect into the contract. OAH has been able to support that and handle that a bit in the past, but we're not going to be able to do it any longer, there's really just not enough time. We're kind of headed into the end here of your grants, and every minute counts at this point. So please meet all reporting due dates, at a minimum. Early submission is allowable, encouraged, much appreciated, so please do that - that's fine. And if you have any questions about the new reporting deadlines, please contact your Project Officer as soon as possible or you can contact me as well and we'll get that all straightened out for you.

So I'll be on the webinar the entire time today, and hopefully I'll be able to answer any questions that come up. So I'll turn it back to you guys at Mathematica now so we can get started. Thank you.

Great. Thanks, Amy. I'm going to turn it over to Juliette Henke, who is going to talk about the evaluation progress report.

Thanks, Jean.

So today I'm going to go through some revisions that have been made to the requirements for your biannual evaluation progress report as well as review a few critical reminders about compiling these reports.

As you know, the report consists of two main components. The first is the CONSORT diagrams documenting the intake and flow of your sample, both at the youth level and the cluster level as appropriate. The second is the tables assessing the equivalence of the treatment and comparison groups on pre-intervention measures of demographics and behavioral indicators.

At this stage in your evaluation, most of you have submitted multiple tables with each report, one for all youth that completed the baseline survey, and one for each post-intervention survey wave that includes baseline measures for the sample that responded to that survey.

For future reporting, we're now going to ask you to focus these baseline equivalence tables now that each grantee has drafted a plan for conducting impact analyses. We want to focus the progress reports on the data that will be included in your final reports to OAH and FYSB. Specifically, the baseline equivalence tables now only need to focus on the focal time periods for your specified research questions and the measures of interest in those questions as well. And we'll talk about that in more detail a little later in the presentation.

First, though, I want to go over a few reminders about completing that first component, the CONSORT diagram. We want to make sure, first, that we understand the context of the data that you are reporting. Specifically we want to know how current are the data included in that report. To provide this information, we're asking you to put a time stamp on your CONSORT diagrams, and we've added to this template a place for you to put this time stamp to make it easier for us to ascertain this information. For example, the next report for OAH grantees is being submitted March 31st. However, you may have completed your last survey effort and have clean survey data through the end of February. You should put that time stamp, specifically February 28th, on your CONSORT diagrams. This is to help us identify whether any lag exists between the date that the report was submitted and the date of the data included in it.

We've also asked you to provide, for each survey period, the number of consented youth, by treatment group, that were eligible for that survey as of that time stamp. On the most recent CONSORT diagram, you've included information about individual non-response for that survey. This is an extension of that in that some youth, for those of you with rolling services and data collection, may not have yet reached the point at which you are going to collect certain follow-up data. Having this information will allow us to correctly assess their rate of attrition rather than assuming all of the youth without survey data have attrited from your evaluation.

Next, as usual, all grantees should provide the individual level CONSORT diagrams. QEDs and cluster RCTs should also provide diagrams documenting the sample flow at the cluster or site level.

Lastly, for both the individual and your cluster-level CONSORTs, if you've enrolled multiple cohorts in your evaluation, you should pool all the data for all the cohorts into one CONSORT diagram.

Now I'm going to return to the baseline equivalence table, the second component of your report.

As I mentioned briefly, we've made a few revisions to the guidelines for how you should be compiling these tables. Now that you've documented your impact analysis plans, we want to focus these assessments on your intended analyses and the related samples, which should also help to relieve some burden in completing these reports.

First, you now only need to provide tables for your intended analytic samples, in addition to the full sample that completed the baseline survey. So you will likely submit two or more tables with pre-intervention data, one for sample that completed the baseline survey, one for the sample that completed the follow-up survey or surveys that are the focal time period for your primary research questions, and one more for the sample that completed the follow-up surveys for the focal time periods for any secondary research questions, if those are different from those that are used in the primary analyses.

Additionally, you should assess the samples on the measures that will be used in your analyses. For behavioral measures, this means you include only those measures identified as primary or secondary outcomes. The other OAH behavioral measures don't need to be included.

For demographic characteristics, you will still include all demographic variables, but for race and ethnicity you should construct that measure as you plan to for your analyses.

To help you understand what these guidelines look like in practice, I'm going to go through an example of what may be a common scenario for grantees.

In this example, the grantee is focusing their analyses on three research questions across two time periods. At six months, they plan to look at the outcome of initiation of sexual activity. At the 12-month follow up, they will look at that outcome as well as intercourse in the prior three months.

Under the revised guidelines, the grantee will provide three tables assessing sample equivalents, one for baseline, one for the six-month follow up, and one for 12-month follow up. The sample for the baseline survey will be all youth who completed that baseline survey and include all demographic measures as well as two behavioral measures, initiation of sexual activity and intercourse in the prior three months.

The next table, for the six-month follow up, will present pre-intervention data for the sample that completed the six-month survey, specifically presenting all demographics and only the measure of initiation of sexual activity, as that's the only outcome to be analyzed with that survey data. Then, the last table will present data for the sample of youth completing the 12-month survey, again on all demographics and baseline measures for both intended outcomes.

Lastly, I just want to go through a few reminders in submitting the baseline equivalence tables. These aren't revisions, just considerations to be mindful of as you complete the next report.

First, for each table you submit, you should be assessing the equivalence of the groups using pre-intervention or baseline data even though you may be defining your analytic sample based on who completed a follow-up survey. The table should not be presenting outcome data collected during those follow-up surveys.

Also, if you're going to be analyzing the risk behavior measures, such as contraceptive use in the prior three months or activity count measures, such as the number of times youth had sex in the prior three

months, we want you to lose logical imputation to impute zero values for those youth who have indicated that they have not had sex at all on the initial survey questions.

Lastly, as with the CONSORT diagrams, please make sure to pool all data for all cohorts if you've had multiple cohorts enrolled in your evaluation.

So as you prepare your next progress report, note that as part of our assessment on the previous report submissions, we will be providing feedback on those materials that you submitted. These include individualized notes on things to correct or be aware of as you prepare this and future reports. As we near the end of the grants and evaluations, we want to make sure that we have the necessary materials to provide you with an accurate assessment of the state of the evaluation as it may be assessed against HHS evidence standards. Therefore, as we complete our assessment of the next round of progress reports, your TA liaison may ask you to resubmit your report if the materials submitted don't align with some of the guidelines as laid out today - for example, pooling data for cohorts or using pre-intervention data in assessments of baseline equivalents.

We encourage you to contact your liaison prior to submitting the next report if you have any questions.

And now I'm going to turn it over to Subuhi Asheer, who is going to talk about the implementation analysis template.

Thanks, Juliette. As Jean mentioned, my name is Subuhi Asheer, and I'm working with Jacqueline Berman and others on the team on the implementation analysis task, and I look forward to working with all of you in the coming weeks and months, of course.

So as mentioned earlier, OAH and FYSB are asking all grantees to provide an implementation analysis plan as part of your March 2014 reporting requirement. This implementation analysis plan is different from the implementation plans that you may have provided to your Project Officer in the past. Those focus on implementation logistics, whereas these analysis plans will focus more on documenting the implementation data that you've collected and how you will use it in your evaluation.

So we at Mathematica have developed a tool to help you develop your plan and report your findings to make the process as simple and straightforward as possible and also to avoid additional burden wherever we can.

I will start by touching on the targeted purpose and scope of the implementation analysis and the context of your evaluations and final reporting requirements, and then we'll walk through the specifics of the analysis plan template, and wrap up with next steps. And as Jean mentioned, there will be time at the end for questions, of course.

Okay. So why do you have to do this analysis? What is the purpose? Generally speaking, of course, implementation analysis is important in describing the implementation of your programs on the ground, what really happened. The more targeted purpose here is to describe your program implementation in a way that best contextualizes your impact findings and also tells a big-picture story in the final report.

Another important reason to conduct this analysis is, of course, that it may offer explanations and theories for why a particular program did or did not have impact. So our hope is that the template we've designed will guide you in developing these plans in a consistent and structured way that aligns with final reports.

Okay. So for the purposes of your final report, we want you to examine four aspects of implementation which are shown here on this slide: adherence, quality, counterfactual and context.

Now why did we choose these elements? First, these are the main factors that will help you unpack program implementation into interpretable pieces, and these have been deemed to be most relevant to interpreting impacts.

Second, we want to avoid adding more to your already busy plates, and these fit well with your existing data collection for performance measures.

And lastly, we think that using these four elements to guide your analyses will help make the implementation section structured and concise so that it can be easily incorporated into your final report.

So before discussing the actual reporting template, let's just look at what we mean by each of these terms.

One of the key things that you will be assessing is the degree to which the delivered intervention on the ground was consistent with what was planned, otherwise known as adherence. For this analysis plan, you will tell us how you will examine adherence. So, what was delivered, for example, the number and frequency of sessions. What was received, which in this case includes what and how much planned program content youth received based on their attendance. What content was delivered, such as the topics covered or activities completed. And who delivered it, for example, the types and number of staff with requisite qualifications, the changes in staff structure or requirements, etc. So that's adherence.

The next aspect of implementation that your analyses will examine is how well the program was implemented and received by participants, that is the quality of program delivery. Now we know that quality is included as part of your performance measure reporting and that some of you may even be doing additional measures or ratings of quality. The plan asks you to include assessment of quality only if you're using a scientific method for assessing program delivery through observations. For example, if you're using quality rating scale or a validated instrument to measure the quality of interactions or the level of youth engagement, you would document that here.

For each aspect of implementation where you are assessing quality, please be sure to provide a definition of what quality means. So, for example, what is the benchmark for a high quality versus low quality interaction between staff and youth.

If, on the other hand, you are not assessing quality, please provide an explanation of why. For example, if your program is a home visiting model that did not allow onsite observations, you would document that in the plan and let us know.

So the third important element for implementation analysis is the counterfactual. That is, of course, the effective difference between what youth in the program group experience versus what youth in the control group experience. So in your plan you would tell us how you would assess the counterfactual in terms of the same criteria that we looked at for adherence. So, for example, what was delivered, by whom, what were the contents, and how much was received by youth in the control group.

So in your final report, for example, you would be able to say that youth in the control group received standard case management services for a year and a 45-minute home visit from a trained social worker once in two months. So that's just an example of how you might report what you would document.

The last element is context. We know that there are several factors, environmental factors, situations, external events, or aspects of the program setting or location, which can also affect program implementation in either a planned or an unplanned manner. For example, there may be other teen pregnancy prevention programs that youth have access to, or there may be school closures that affected program delivery, etc. And sometimes these or other factors also result in substantial changes to the way a program is implemented. So the plan asks you to report how you would document these factors and any potential changes that were made to the program's design so that they may provide context for your implementation and for your impact analysis.

So those are the four elements that drive this implementation analysis plan. Now let's move to the actual template for the plan. If you have a printed copy, it might be useful to have it in front of you as we walk through it.

To emphasize again, we want this analysis plan to be a concise discussion of the data that you have collected and analyzed. So the template really just presents structured scaffolding for the presentation of your data and analysis for your final report.

As you'll see, there are three sections and two tables at the end. You will only need to complete the first two sections for this round of reporting, the data sources and data collection section and the implementation analysis section. You will not need to complete Section Three on findings. That is just to help guide you for the write up and final report.

Now let's look at the first section, which is data sources and data collection. In this first section of the plan, you will be documenting the types of data that will be used to assess adherence, quality, counterfactual and context, the four elements we talked about, the source of the data that you will be using to assess those, how often these data are collected, and by whom.

Again, we assume that much of what you're collecting is data that you're collecting as part of your performance measure reporting such as OAH's fidelity monitoring logs, or attendance data, or observations. We have also provided a table, A.1, which is intended to guide you in reporting this information. So here is an example, a sample of that table just so we can take a brief look at the kinds of information you will be reporting in it. As you can see, there are three columns corresponding with the types of data used, the frequency of the data collection sampling, and the party responsible for the data collection. So if we look at adherence, for instance, for data sources, you might list your fidelity monitoring logs, attendance data, school or district records, facilitator feedback forms, or any other types of systematic sources being used to document what is being delivered and what is being received by participants.

Similarly, for quality you would list those data sources such as observational tools or any validated protocols that you're using to look at quality.

So in the second column for frequency, you might report the frequency and sampling method as, for example, once a week facilitators upload fidelity monitoring logs to a shared database. Or if teachers reported attendance daily. Or that for quality, observations are conducted at each session and then ten percent are sampled or reviewed.

In the third column, you would list the types of staff who are responsible for collecting these data. So, for instance, attendance data may be collected by program staff or by school staff, while observational data might be collected by a local evaluator, so you would note who is doing what in this column.

Moving down that table to the other two elements. If we want to look at counterfactual, your data sources might include items on surveys to document what services and information control group youth received, or maybe focus groups of control group youth.

For context your data sources, again, could be focus groups or interviews with community stakeholders or a district website, etc. Again, you would report the timeline for each of these data sources and indicate the types of staff who would collect these data.

So that's the data sources section.

Now that you've told us all the types of data you will be using for assessing implementation, in this next section for the implementation analysis, we want you to report how you will be using these data. What types of analysis you will be doing, and what measures and indicators you will be using.

So using clear benchmarks and indicators, you will report how each of the four implementation elements that we just talked about will be assessed. Just something to keep in mind as you develop the section, it's important that you note anything that might be considered a potential limitation of your analysis, such as issues with data quality or data collection. So, for example, if all the observations were conducted by just

one person, or if they were conducted by program staff rather than an independent evaluator, you would document that here.

So, again, we've included a table, Table A.2, to help you complete this section. And, again, I'll just walk through a couple of examples to show you how this might look once it's completed. The key here is that we want descriptions and analyses for each implementation element in the table. Of course, if you need to, you can include additional text above and beyond what is shown in the table on the plan.

So just to give you a couple of examples, to assess adherence, for instance, your analyses might be to look at content received in terms of the percentage of program group students who attended 75% or more of the program sessions. Or for content delivered, which is not shown here, you might examine the percentage of planned activities that were fully completed and percentage that were only partially completed.

Similarly, for quality, you might look at the percentage of observed sessions that were scored high in terms of the quality of interactions between youth and staff on a standardized scale by an independent observer.

So these are just a couple of examples. As you can see, we're not looking for extensive implementation analysis for the final report. We want the final evaluation report to be a targeted presentation of the impact and key implementation information that's covered in this plan that's necessary for the HHS evidence review. So the implementation section of the report will be short. It will be limited to roughly two to three pages. Those of you planning more extensive implementation analyses than the types we have described here should not cover those in final evaluation reports, but of course these can be the focus of other publications like journal articles or other reporting.

I will just briefly touch on the final section, which is findings, but remember that you will not be presenting your findings in this plan. This is just to guide you for your final reporting.

So for the findings you would use this template and the completed tables as a basis for reporting your findings, which would include descriptive statistics as part of short prose descriptions. We will have more guidance on the final report later, but I've included a couple of examples of potential findings here. So, for instance, the first one, one of your findings on program quality might state that 67% of the questions rated high for youth opportunities to set goals and make plans. There are additional examples of potential findings in the template itself if you want to look at those.

So that's basically the overview of the implementation analysis template and what each of the sections covers.

In terms of next steps, you should use the templates to begin developing implementation analysis plans. And, of course, if you have any questions as you're developing your plans, I encourage you to contact me or Jacqueline Berman, or, of course, your TA liaison, and we'd be happy to provide additional clarification as needed. I know Russ is going next, and he'll go over the submission process as well.

Thank you.

Thanks Subuhi.

So my name is Russell Cole and I'm going to spend the next few minutes of the presentation talking about the evaluation abstract and information on the submission process and timelines for getting all this work done.

The evaluation abstract that has been designed is a brief, approximately two-page, summary of the key features of each evaluation. They've been structured by sections to facilitate comprehensibility, completeness and consistency of information to be presented across all of the grantee evaluations. So in

the instructions provided with each evaluation abstract, most sections indicate that the information to be filled in can be drawn from the impact analysis plan, and there are suggestions for the length of the information to be presented. Two evaluators have graciously volunteered to pilot this effort, that was Children's Home and Need at Carnegie Mellon University, and have shared their abstract as examples to be used to help others prepare their own abstracts. As a result, we believe this should be a relatively straightforward and simple document to prepare.

I'm going to spend a couple of minutes walking through the actual content and structure of the evaluation abstract template. This slide covers the first half of the template.

First, the template requests the contact information for the grantee project director and the lead evaluator so that readers will know who they can reach out to for more information.

Next the template requests structured information about the contrast that is being tested. This includes brief descriptions of the intervention and counterfactual conditions and the names of those interventions and counterfactuals if applicable. Importantly, this also includes a description of any planned adaptations to the intervention for purposes of this study. For example, if the intervention were adapted to be more applicable or culturally appropriate for target populations, or if there are other types of planned modifications such as shortening of the duration of the intervention, those should be described here. In addition, this should include any substantial adaptations that occurred during the course of implementation. Substantial adaptations include those that affect the population, the setting, or the program delivery. For example, if program implementation is only able to occur over the course of eight months instead of the intended nine months.

The template also requests the primary research question from the impact analysis claim template be included. This will allow readers to understand which behavioral outcomes the intervention is expected to influence and at which time points.

The remaining sections of the template are shown here. The template next requests information on the study sample. So this would be brief descriptions on the inclusion criteria for participation as well as enrolled or projected sample sizes for the study.

Next there's a section requesting the geographic setting where the study is taking place, along with information on locations where program services are offered.

We expect that the description of the research design of the study may take multiple paragraphs, for example, describing the process for random assignment if this is a random assignment study, or how groups were formed if this was a quasi-experimental design. This section will also include a description of the consent process, in particular the timing of consent, as well as the timing and processes used for data collection.

The method section of the evaluation abstract will describe how program impacts will be estimated to answer the study's research questions. This will include the methods used for estimation such as the linear probability model or logistic progression, the covariates that will be included, and whether or not adjustments for clustering or multiple comparisons will be used.

The abstract template contains two place holders for findings: Implementation findings as well as the impact findings. These can be left blank at this time since studies are not yet conducting final impact or implementation analyses; however these sections will be filled at a later date when final reports are complete.

The final section of the evaluation abstract requests information on the timing of key evaluation milestones - for example, when data collection periods end, when the final report will be written, or other key evaluation events.

So while this may sound like a lot, the expectation, again, is that this will be less than a two-page document and that much of the material will actually come from the impact analysis plan. As noted earlier, there are two exemplars from grantees that you can help guide your presentation of this information.

So as described in the annual reporting guidance, these submissions are due on March 31st for OAH grantees and May 31st for FYSB grantees. However, as Jean and Amy mentioned earlier, please do submit any of these documents as soon as complete so that we can begin the review process as quickly as possible.

Ultimately to submit these documents, please either email your submissions to the Eval TA mailbox or upload documents to your grantee folders on the Eval TA website.

Please use the following naming conventions to help facilitate the submission process. There are going to be a large number of documents that will be coming over the next few months as you will see on the next few pages. So for the abstract, the file name should be something like grantee name underscore abstracts dot docx. Similar naming conventions should be used for the implementation as well as the consort and equivalence files. We'd like to request that you please submit Word and Excel files so that we can provide feedback using Track Changes and Comments to facilitate an efficient review process.

So in terms lot of process and timeline, this is how things are going to roll out. As has been stated earlier, we know this is a very busy time for everyone, but, again, we've really tried to keep the level of effort for these documents on the low end by maintaining focus on the critical features of these evaluations that are going to be needed for final reporting. And as both Jean and Amy pointed out earlier, these documents are really stepping stones for an efficient presentation and preparation of the final reports. That said, there is going to be a lot of communication with the Eval TA team over the next few months, as evidenced by this table. So as described in the annual progress reporting guidance, these evaluation reporting documents must be submitted by the end of March for OAH grantees and the end of May for FYSB grantees. But we are strongly encouraging you to submit any of these documents as soon as it's completed as this will help expedite the review process.

As seen on the table above, there are multiple rounds of review for each of these documents, and it will be important for us to really try hard to keep these processes moving.

The Eval TA team is going to conduct reviews on a rolling basis in an effort to keep this process moving as efficiently as possible so that all submissions from all grantees can be approved by the end of the contract year.

I did want to highlight two notes about the final stages of review. First, in particular for the evaluation abstract, once an abstract is effectively complete, Mathematica editors will take a final pass at each abstract to ensure that each of these documents are grammatically correct and able to serve as a public facing document that summarizes each evaluation.

And second, either OAH or FYSB will have the final say in the approval of all of these documents. That is, once the Eval TA team deems the document is ready for approval, OAH and FYSB will then provide the final okay before the document is approved.

So, again, there is a lot of churning of documents that will happen over the next few months, and we'll be working hard to make sure that this process moves as quickly and as efficiently as possible.

So that's all that I have right now on processing evaluation abstracts. We've had a lot presented today, annual reporting, implementation analysis plans, so this is probably a good time to open up for questions. I believe that we have received some already.

Yes, one of the first questions that we got before Russ presented the timeline was clarifying the timeline, and so we wanted to make sure that Amy could cover the timelines for all of the OAH reporting since many of those pieces are shifting for you folks. Amy, do you want to cover the timelines?

Okay, sure. So this is in relation only to OAH TPP grantees. The FYSB reporting deadlines are all remaining the same.

So my understanding is that the OAH TPP reporting deadlines, your continuation applications and your annual progress reports will remain the same is my understanding. Those will still be end of May, and end of November. What's shifted to March, and will shift to September, is your progress reporting, your six-month progress reporting, your evaluation reporting, and the reporting of your performance measure of data. So that's all going to be due earlier. So it actually should help you guys a little bit in kind of splitting up what you've been sending in all at the same time. But also it's helping our Project Officers so that it's splitting up what they need to review. And I actually think this change stems from feedback from the grantees that they weren't getting timely enough feedback, that you were submitting all your performance measure data and not hearing, you know, for several months until everything had been reviewed, and this way you can get some more timely feedback. So that's my understanding of the shift in the timelines.

Great. Thanks, Amy.

So we had a couple of questions about the implementation analysis plan template. One was a clarification about where the Table A1 is that Subuhi was covering. So that is in the implementation analysis plan template. I can actually open that up. This is a copy of it that's on Share Point. There it is. So it's in the appendices of the template.. She was showing you, you know, an abbreviated version of that on PowerPoint.

So one person asked about whether the observational form that OAH and FYSB grantees use for their observations is considered a validated protocol. We weren't involved in the development of that, but if that is something that you, as an evaluator, are planning to use, you should include that in your report as a tool that you will use. I don't think it's mandated that you use that, but if that's a measure of quality that you want to use in your evaluation, then you should include that in your plan.

Okay, Amy, we have two clarifications just on the timelines you were just mentioning. One is will they get written guidelines on the shifting deadlines for various reports, and I believe that is forthcoming but just has not arrived yet. The second thing is that they wanted to know if data uploads to the RTI website are due not at the end of May but are now due at the end of March, and I believe that's true for OAH grantees. Is that correct?

Yeah, that's absolutely right. All performance measure data is now due the end of March and in September. And the other question was about the written guidance, yes, of course, there's written guidance that goes out before the every six-month reporting period that will come from the grant office.

Joann Jensen is here. She is going to clarify that answer since she is the contact person on that.

You will receive a grant managements request for the May 31st reporting like you always have. But since we've broken this one out, you will be receiving from the Project Officers guidance for your end of March reporting. So you're going to be getting that just probably by the end of this week, beginning of next week. Were you able to hear that?

It was a little fuzzy from our end. I'm not sure how folks heard it on the line.

Okay, basically Joann said that all the guidance should be arriving towards the end of this week. A part of it, the part that involves the May reporting, will come from the Grants Office. The other part of it that involves the March reporting is going to come from the Project Officers.

Great. Okay, we have a couple of questions on the evaluation reporting, the CONSORT diagrams and the baseline equivalence. One person was asking about sort of the six and 12-month data that Juliette was discussing. So those were examples that she was discussing. We know that not everyone has an exactly six month or exactly a 12 month. So you're going to pick the time points that you are using for your primary analyses and secondary analyses. Some people might be looking at, you know, 18 months after random assignment. Or 24 months. So you're going to tell us, based on your analysis plan, what the timeframes are that you are looking at that define your analytic samples, and you're going to look at baseline equivalence for those analytic samples. And that's exactly how the evidence review will review your final evaluation report. They're going to say, for the sample of youth that you've estimated your impacts on, and that might be your 18-month sample, did those kids look the same before the intervention started, if there was, say, high attrition in an RCT. So you're customizing this for your evaluation. That was just an example.

Someone else asked if they accidentally included some outcome measures in a prior reporting, should they go back and re-do that? No, not at this point. Just for the next reporting, make sure that it's only baseline variables, so pre-intervention measures for the sample that's defined by an outcome data collection. And we'll start pushing a little bit harder on that because there aren't many reporting periods left and we want to make sure that everybody is prepared to set themselves up to meet these HHS evidence standards as your evaluations are winding down.

Someone else just asked a question about measuring quality, and they said "are observational data the only method that could be used to measure quality?" and no, that's not the case. If you have other measures that would be used to measure quality, you can certainly include those as well. Again, this was just an example of one that we knew that many of you had because you've been out there doing observations.

There's another question about when you're allowed to impute zeros for the assessments of baseline equivalence. Again, you're going to narrow down the set of measures that you're going to report for us this time. So if there's a measure of the number of times someone had sex in the last three months and that's not a measure that you're going to look at in your final report, then you don't need to report that for us right now. If you are, you can perform any logical imputations, which are when you already know the answer to a question because of something else they've already told you. So if they answer that they've had sex, you know they haven't had sex in the last three months, you know they've never been pregnant, you know the number of times they've ever had sex and the past three months is zero. So you can do those logical imputations where effectively you know the answer, you probably put them through a skip pattern so they skipped those questions intentionally so they didn't have to keep saying no, no, zero. So those are the only sorts of imputations we want you to do before you do your baseline equivalence assessments.

And there was one other question that came in, particular for a grantee that has a random assignment study with three different treatment groups. As you've previously done, you've been focusing only on a subset of those comparisons, for your baseline equivalence comparisons, .You should be doing the same types of baseline equivalence tables in this round of annual reporting. So only report the baseline equivalence tables for the handful of contrasts that you will be ultimately doing in your final report.

Okay. I think that's all the questions that we've received electronically at this point. It looks like we have enough time to unmute the lines to see if anybody else who perhaps is not in front of a computer has a question. So I'm going to unmute the lines now, if I can figure out how to do that.

I apologize. We have a new system here. It looks like if we try to unmute you, everybody has to get sent a special PIN. At least that's what it's looking like. So rather than unmute all the lines that way, because it doesn't look like many of you signed in through the PC-based system, we will just wait one more minute and see if there are any questions that get sent in electronically. And, again, you should absolutely feel free to reach to any of us if you have additional questions in the future.

One question just came through.

And we did just put the contact information up in case you have particular questions for any of the presenters here.

So one question came in on whether or not the grantees that are not using an RCT, so the quasi-experimental studies – whether or not they should include cluster information, cluster CONSORT diagrams. Yes, we are hoping that for future reports, for the coming report and the remaining reports, that the quasi-experimental designs can submit a cluster-level consort diagram just so that we can verify systematically the presence of all the cluster sites that you are using to make sure there are no confounding factors.

And then someone also asked where they will be able to find a copy of the slides for today's presentation. We're going to post them on the Share Point site along with a recording and transcription of this presentation. I don't know the exact folder that it will be in, but we will get that posted this week. We can post the slides right away and the recording. The transcript will be later this week, and we'll send out an announcement about that.

So someone asked who to reach for each type of question. On the introduction slide, the first slide of the presentation, it said who did each piece, but I'll go over it again. So Juliette Henke, if you have any questions about the CONSORT diagrams and the baseline equivalence. Subuhi Asheer or Jacqueline Berman if you have any questions about the implementation analysis plan. And you can reach out to Russ Cole if you have any questions about the abstract template.

Or, alternately, just contact your TA liaison and they'll sort the email to the right person.

Okay. We have a couple more questions that have come in.

So there's one question that we have to think about a little bit more. We will reach out. It's on one of the quality measures.

A couple of these are fairly specific questions about whether something would be considered, say, a validated instrument, and that's exactly the type of thing that we're going to be considering as we're reviewing your documents. If you're planning on using a measure, we're going to look at it with several implementation experts and see if they have any potential concerns or if they think there are any limitations to the plan. So you should document the types of things that you've been planning on using, and if we have any concerns about those, we can raise them during the review process. We don't have to vet everything in advance.

Okay, are there any other questions?

All right. Well, thank you everyone for joining us, and we look forward to learning even more about your evaluations through our review of the documents. And we will get these slides and presentation posted for any of you who want to listen to it again or if you have any colleagues that weren't able to join us and they should review as well.

Thank you very much and have a great day.