

Case Study 2

Work with your group to design a randomized evaluation of the following program:

About 5 percent of patients in the U.S. account for 25 percent of ER visits, in part because some frequent 911 callers call in for health issues that do not require emergency care. Imagine that you work for a county that is concerned about the health, lack of access to care, and healthcare costs of a group of frequent 911 callers. Your county is brainstorming ways to help address the health concerns of this population, reduce burdens on emergency personnel and resources, and better match patients to the appropriate level of care. The county thinks individual case management and/or transportation vouchers for this population may help, and has decided to try out these programs. Hospital records show that 3,000 people in your county are frequent 911 callers (contributing to 12,000 calls per year), but at this point, you only have funds to provide case management for 800 people and transportation vouchers for 800 people.

match patients to the appropriate level of care. The county thinks individual case management and/or transportation vouchers for this population may help, and has decided to try out these programs. Hospital records show that 3,000 people in your county are frequent 911 callers (contributing to 12,000 calls per year), but at this point, you only have funds to provide case management for 800 people and transportation vouchers for 800 people.
Part 1: Forming the research question 1) What is the issue?
2) What is the intervention(s) you will study?
3) What outcomes would you want to measure? Which outcomes do you care most about?
4) Who is your study population?
5) Taking these together, what is your research question? Typically, RCT research questions take the form of, "What is the impact of [intervention(s)] on [primary outcome] among [study population]?"
Part 2: Diving into research design 1) In order to study this program, how would you suggest the organization allocates the intervention?
2) Who is the treatment group? Who represents the counterfactual?



Case Study 2

3) Assuming implementation is successful, why will we be confident in the results?

Part 3: Getting into the details

- 1) What data sources may contain data on your primary outcomes of interest (see Part 1, Q3 above)?
- 2) What process metrics do you want to measure to make sure the intervention is implemented as planned? What would you measure to make sure program implementation is successful? How would you know if the program implementation was <u>not</u> successful?
- 3) What is your sample size? How many people are in the treatment group? The comparison group?
- 4) Whose buy-in do you need to get to run an evaluation? Who are the stakeholders? How will you communicate to them about the goals of the evaluation and get all involved on the same page?

Part 4: Creating a plan for sharing results and scaling impact

Next steps would involve working with an evaluator or researcher and:

- (i) having conversations about feasibility (political feasibility based on stakeholder input and study feasibility based on sample size and design considerations)
- (ii) determining the appropriate research design (e.g. randomization protocol and consent process)
- (iii) getting IRB approval
- (iv) piloting to ensure the RCT runs smoothly
- (v) implementing the study and
- (vi) sharing results to generate policy impact.

Let's say the program is successful. Who do you want to share results with? What are potential routes to policy impact?