QC Lunch & Learn Series

1. **Overview of QC at SRO** – Monday, April 19 - 12:00 noon

   This session will introduce you to the QC Implementation Team, quality control philosophy, and will provide an overview of quality control processes for interviewer-administered data collection at SRO.

2. **QC Technical Systems and Tools** – Thursday, May 6 - 12:00 noon

   This session will introduce the technical systems and quality control tools used for recording interviews, completing evaluations and verifications, and reporting QC results.

3. **Measuring and Modifying Interviewer Behavior** – Thursday, May 20 - 12:00 noon

   This session will show how we measure interviewer behavior, adherence to standardized interview protocols, and how we provide evaluation feedback and training to interviewers.

4. **Project Considerations Related to QC** – Monday, June 14 - 12:00 noon

   This session will discuss a variety of issues for projects to consider, including budgeting for QC, selecting the material to evaluate, alternative verification methods, handling possible falsification, and IRB issues related to QC.

Agenda

- Budgeting and Cost Monitoring
- IRB Issues
- QC Plan and QC Roles
- Evaluation Planning
- Verification Planning
- Handling Possible Falsification
- Questions / Discussion

Budgeting and Cost Monitoring

Default Budgeting

- Field and SSL projects' QC hours are typically budgeted as:
  - For Production (evaluation **and** verification):
    - SSL TL hours:
      - 5 hours for each interviewer (2.5 hours * 2 IWs) +
      - 2.5 hours for 10% of Total # of IWs
    - Prod Mgr II hours:
      - 7.5% of SSL TL QC hours
- For QC training, Field projects include:
  - Approximately 40 hours are budgeted to train evaluators and verifiers (budgeted at SSL TL rate)

Actual Flagging Implementation

- Varies, but typically:
  - Eval: 1 initial iw from each iwer (in each language), 5% Randomly thereafter, + extra to follow up on past poor evals and/or due to paradata flagging
  - Ver: 2 of each iwer's first iws (that were not evaluated), 10% thereafter

Actual Implementation

- Varies, but typically:
  - Eval: Time of Eval team coordinators, Training of Evaluators and Retrainers, Evaluation and Retraining (by higher-level SSL STs and Field Iwers), ongoing training: IRR and calibration exercises
  - Ver: Time of Ver team coordinator, Ver training, Ver by regular-level SSL STs
  - + Project QC Coordinator
  - + DM or Sarah Broumand's time for set-up and ongoing maintenance, as applicable

Budget vs Implementation

- Iwer staffing Model can determine implementation
  - E.g. SSL vs Field or both; centralized or decentralized or both
  - Number of trainings
- Technical Systems are also important
  - "Default" budget model does not differ between technical systems
- Actual titles of those carrying out QC work can vary

QC Shortcodes

- Policy on Intranet
  - Update: iwer retraining will be charged to Main Data Collection

Cost Monitoring

- QC Team Reports + Target CRS reports from Financial Services
- Anticipate curve of Eval and Ver expenses
  - Default protocol for both calls heavily driven by training plans
  - Expect an early surge in costs, then a long, diminishing tail

10

Estimating Hours per Evaluation

- Evaluation costs more than Verification and HPE is a significant driver of overall QC cost.
- Evaluation list length is related to, but doesn't fully determine HPE
- HPE= ~1.5 to 2.5x the length of the list.
  - However, fixed cost per eval of ~30 mins.
- The more atypical the content, the higher the cost (eval training and evaluation)
- How to limit HPE besides shortening the list--Maybe limit the Eval summary section? Area for discussion

11

HRS Eval Cost Monitoring

- Project weekly eval hours using project weekly iw goals and eval flagging plan
- Estimate of the number of Quality Concern cases each week, times the actual Hours per Evaluation (HPE--from the QC production report).
    - Estimate retraining hours using anticipated completed evals, actual retraining percentage and the actual retrainer HPE.
- See Rick, Dan or Andrea for details

Design/Technical Infrastructure

- Currently: a wide variety of technical designs for QC
- Some are more standard (and less costly) than others
- Atypical project technical infrastructures or unique requests for iw QC flagging, evaluation lists, verification designs, etc. may entail additional cost.

IRB issues related to QC

IRB: Detail May Vary

- Level of detail in application may vary significantly by project/organization
- Details of evaluation and verification plans are not typically considered regulated
  - E.g. Verification: Instrument, Verification Contact protocols, not typically subject to review
  - If you intend to publish, QC would be regulated

IRB: Minimally . . .

- Evaluation: Note fact of recording and justification, Consent to Record, Security of files (e.g. in data security template)

- Verification: Note fact of verification

- Detection of falsification is often reportable

QC Plan Template & Roles

Drafting the QC Plan

- [Central location for all projects](#)
- Project QC Coordinator drafts in consultation with Project Lead, Tech Lead, and Key QC Imp Team members
- Project team attends a QC Imp Team Meeting
- Broadly outlines Eval and Ver plans
  - Schedule work according to iwer training and production schedule. Don't forget to plan for Spanish (or other non-English) iws

Evaluation

19

Selecting Material to Evaluate

- Standard GIT--for comparison across projects
- Project-Specific content of special importance
  - "Project Significant" content: Requiring verbal retraining if administered in error, regardless of thresholds
  - Will entail additional training
- For Eval training consider identifying content by reason for inclusion on eval list

20

Varying Eval List

- Best practice to vary
  - Keep iwers from knowing the plan
  - Evaluate various parts of the iw
- Significant tech flexibility to have different eval lists, even simultaneously (as long as the logic is clearly defined).
  - May be cost trade-offs in programming and in implmentation

21

Verification

Selecting Verification Content

- Standard Qs--5 (+ Physical/Bio) & Optional R Comments
- Project-specific Qs (1-4):

--Should be questions of fact

--Should clearly include all response options in the question text.

--Should not be "select all that apply."

--Should not ask if events happened during a specific amount of time previous to the interview.

23

Why do verification callbacks?

- Rs can be hard to reach again
- Classic Verification has a very low "hit rate" in detecting falsification

- However, may deter falsification
- R comments are often useful
- Verification remains an industry expectation

Alternative Verification Methods

- Systematic phone number matching

- Web Ver survey

- Mailings
  - PAPI Ver q'naire
  - Post card to return with feedback

Handling Possible Falsification

Develop a Plan

- Production and Project Managers should collaborate
- DCO will typically halt iwer's production work
- Notify the Senior Project Advisor
- Track work via a spreadsheet
- Predetermine decision points and set a timeline

Phases

- Identification
- Investigation
- Recommendation/Resolution
- Reporting
  - PI(s)
  - IRB?
  - Cost

Possible Investigation Techniques

- Carefully question the iwer (typically DCO)
- Verify/or otherwise speak to the R(s)
- Use audit trail data to assess question admin times
- Compare audit trail overall timings to duration of phone calls
- Compare audit trail time of day to sample management system (SMS) data
- Match phone numbers in bills to the SMS data

Possible Investigation Techniques

- Review iw data:
  - Rates of Consent to Record
  - Compare key variables to other iwers' iws, and/or to past waves
  - Rates of DK/RF
  - "Short Path" rates on gateway questions

Discussion / Questions?