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Overview

• Brief description of UW Survey Center CATI Department

• CATI Quality Control Monitoring Process in 2010

• CATI Quality Control Monitoring Process in 2011

• Target measures of the success of the new protocols
  • Frequency of interviewer feedback
  • Cost efficiency of supervisor time
  • Interviewer performance
• Currently ~94 telephone interviewers

• About 80-130 interviewers from September 2010 to April 2011

• Approximately 63 CATI booths

• 15-20 telephone projects in field
Quality control monitoring of CATI interviewing staff is a crucial part of achieving success in delivering high quality data to our clients.

© 2010. Materials may not be reproduced without permission of the author
• Shift Leaders (SL’s) directly supervise telephone interviewers and are responsible for monitoring and giving quality control feedback

• 1-2 Shift Leaders “on the floor;” one SL assigned to monitor during each 4-hour shift

• Telephone interviewers monitored once every 30 days (minimum)
### CATI Quality Control Monitoring Process 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEWER</th>
<th>BOOTH</th>
<th>LAST CALL</th>
<th>LAST PNUM</th>
<th>LAST MON</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>SL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHMEDUDDIN, SAAD (2597)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17:56:47</td>
<td>P9830_05</td>
<td>2011-04-11 V</td>
<td>FULL jav</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKUNOWICZ, NICK (2598)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17:18:33</td>
<td>P9612</td>
<td>2011-04-26 V</td>
<td>FULL bml</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSE, PETER (2533)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17:57:19</td>
<td>P9846_04</td>
<td>2011-03-21 E</td>
<td>FULL gww</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBARBIERI, PAUL (604)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17:55:18</td>
<td>P9830_05</td>
<td>2011-03-29 G</td>
<td>FULL jeg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAKIMI, AHMAD (2614)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17:49:48</td>
<td>P9830_05</td>
<td>2011-04-26 E</td>
<td>PART bml</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUELLWITZ, SAMUEL (2574)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17:57:19</td>
<td>P9846_04</td>
<td>2011-04-15 V</td>
<td>FULL jav</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODENS, KATRINA (2622)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17:51:04</td>
<td>P9844_02</td>
<td>2011-05-01 V</td>
<td>FULL bml</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSWALD, RYAN (2637)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17:56:56</td>
<td>P9699</td>
<td>2011-04-28 G</td>
<td>PART ptv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRRUCCELLO, SAMUEL (2588)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17:57:14</td>
<td>P9844_02</td>
<td>2011-04-22 E</td>
<td>FULL jal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHULTZ, LEO (2624)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17:54:18</td>
<td>P9840</td>
<td>2011-04-26 E</td>
<td>PART bml</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOTTLER, JACOB (2473)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17:57:44</td>
<td>P9830_05</td>
<td>2011-04-10 E</td>
<td>FULL bml</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMPSON, ANGELA (2592)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17:50:51</td>
<td>P9830_05</td>
<td>2011-04-19 G</td>
<td>PART jed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

! denotes a priority
CATI Quality Control Monitoring Process 2010

- SL’s used silent-entry monitoring system to monitor both audio and video in real time
  - VNC Viewer (software)
  - Tone Commander (hardware)
Would you say that in general your health is excellent, very good, good, fair or poor?

- 1: EXCELLENT
- 2: VERY GOOD
- 3: GOOD
- 4: FAIR
- 5: POOR
- d: DON'T KNOW / NOT SURE
- r: REFUSED
CATI Quality Control Monitoring Process 2010

- Two types of monitoring evaluations:
  - “Full” monitoring evaluation
  - “Random” monitoring evaluation
CATI Quality Control Monitoring Process 2010

- Shift Leader told interviewer they’ve been monitored
- Interviewer waited until Shift Leader fills out standardized QC form
- Shift Leader gave performance feedback to interviewer
- Shift Leader electronically filed evaluation form and recorded:
  - Who was monitored
  - Type of evaluation completed ("full" or "random")
  - Overall monitoring score ("excellent," "very good," "good," "adequate," or "unacceptable")
Standardized “Full” Monitoring Evaluation Form

- Verbatim
- Reading entire question
- Neutral probes
- Remaining objective
- Tuning
- Verification
- Appropriate refusal responses
- Recording responses accurately
- Training the respondent
- Professionalism
CATI Quality Control Monitoring Process 2010

New Monitoring

Project: p9830_04: BRFSS 2011 April

Type: Full  Score: Excellent

Date: May 08 2011  Shiftleader:

Notes:

Save
CATI Quality Control Monitoring Process in 2011
Reasons for changing UWSC CATI Monitoring Protocols

• Staffing levels quickly increased
• Provide tailored feedback to new employees productively and efficiently
• Provide more feedback to all interviewers more frequently
• Incorporate more feedback regarding the first 30 seconds of respondent-interviewer interaction
• Create accountability (SL management)
Modifications to the CATI Monitoring Process

• Recordings
  • Shift Leaders are required to digitally record all high-priority interviewers at beginning of shift
  • Recordings for studies in Wisconsin only

• Type of feedback
  • Full monitorings
  • Partial monitorings (new)
Modifications to the CATI Monitoring Process

- Structure of monitoring shift
  - Flag high-priority interviewers to be recorded
  - Listen to live calling first 30 minutes of 4 hour shift
  - After first 30 minutes, check recordings for completed interviews
  - Listen to recorded interview(s) or watch for live interviews
  - Last 30 minutes, live calling again (partials)
### Monitor This Shift

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEWER</th>
<th>BOOTH LAST CALL</th>
<th>LAST PNUM</th>
<th>LAST MON</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>SL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHMEDUDDIN, SAA (2597)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P9830_05</td>
<td>2011-04-11</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>FULL</td>
<td>jav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKUNOWICZ, NICK (2598)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>P9612</td>
<td>2011-04-26</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>FULL</td>
<td>bml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSE, PETER (2533)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>P9846_04</td>
<td>2011-03-21</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>FULL</td>
<td>gww</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEARBREIBERI, PAUL (604)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P9830_05</td>
<td>2011-03-29</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>FULL</td>
<td>jeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAKIMI, AHMAD (2614)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P9830_05</td>
<td>2011-04-26</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>PART</td>
<td>bml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUELLWITZ, SAMUEL (2574)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>P9846_04</td>
<td>2011-04-15</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>FULL</td>
<td>jav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODENS, KATRINA (2622)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>P9844_02</td>
<td>2011-05-01</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>FULL</td>
<td>bml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSWALD, RYAN (2637)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>P9699</td>
<td>2011-04-28</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>PART</td>
<td>ptt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRRUCCELLO, SAMUEL (2588)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>P9844_02</td>
<td>2011-04-22</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>FULL</td>
<td>jal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHULTZ, LEO (2624)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>P9840</td>
<td>2011-04-26</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>PART</td>
<td>bml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOTTLE, JACOB (2473)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>P9830_05</td>
<td>2011-04-10</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>FULL</td>
<td>bml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMPSON, ANGELA (2592)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P9830_05</td>
<td>2011-04-19</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>PART</td>
<td>jed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

! denotes a **priority**
Standardized “Partial” Monitoring Evaluation Form

- Able to answer questions and provide information about study and UWSC
- Appropriate use of refusal aversion techniques
- Follows general procedures
- Properly writes case notes
- Additional comments
- Overall score
CATI Quality Control Monitoring Process in 2011

• Summary of protocol changes:
  • Incorporated digital recordings
  • Different types of feedback
  • More structured monitoring shifts
What We Expected (Target Measures)

• Increased productivity
  • Increased frequency of feedback
  • Interviewers no longer have to wait prior to performance feedback

• Decrease in cost per monitoring

• Increase in interviewer performance (fewer “adequate” and “unacceptable” scores over time)
Frequency of Performance Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Random/Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frequency of Performance Feedback

Completed Monitorings by Number of Interviewers

- Red line: Random/Partial
- Blue line: Full

Timeline: Sept '10 to April '11
Total Cost Per Monitoring Evaluation

- Sep '10: $120
- Oct '10: $60
- Nov '10: $40
- Dec '10: $40
- Jan '11: $40
- Feb '11: $40
- Mar '11: $40
- Apr '11: $60
Cost Per Monitoring Evaluation

Pre-Modification
- Full: $71
- Random/Partial: $550

Post-Modification
- Full: $46
- Random/Partial: $89
Interviewer Monitoring Evaluation Scores

Rate of “Adequate” and “Unacceptable” Monitoring Scores

Sept '10  Oct '10  Nov '10  Dec '10  Jan '11  Feb '11  Mar '11  April '11
Things to Consider (Confounding Variables)

- **Staffing levels:**
  - Number of Shift Leaders
  - Number of interviewers
  - Number of new interviewers (training)

- **Work load**

- **Continuous monitoring of Shift Leader QC performance**
CATI Staffing Levels

- SL's
- Monitoring Shifts
- New Interviewers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>SL's</th>
<th>Monitoring Shifts</th>
<th>New Interviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons Learned

• Shift Leaders are now able to use all 4 hours of monitoring shifts to work on providing feedback

• Accountability of SL staff

• Increased both the frequency and cost efficiency of giving feedback to interviewers

• Increased variety of feedback given

• More feedback to interviewers means improved data quality

• Future implications
Thank You!
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