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Overview

• Define hard-to-find, traumatized, and/or vulnerable populations
• Describe the context of our study
• Introduce three data collection methods
• Highlight results regarding response rate
• Discuss implication for evaluation
Background

- Many populations targeted for evaluation are hard-to-find, traumatized, and/or vulnerable (HTF-T-V)
- Socially and physically disenfranchised, stigmatized, and/or traumatized
  - Urban poor, homeless, undocumented immigrants, drug users, LGBT, sex workers, battered women, rape survivors
- HTF-T-V pose methodological challenges for evaluators
  - Sampling
  - Data Collection
Context of Our Project

- Program provides medical forensic exams & crisis intervention IMMEDIATELY post assault
- Program wanted to assess survivors’ perceptions of the quality of care received during exam
- How do you collect evaluation data directly from survivors IMMEDIATELY post assault?
Context of Our Project

- Evaluation needed to flow into normal services
- We, the evaluators, could NOT collect the data ourselves for multiple reasons
  - Logistics
  - Sensitivity to circumstances
- Program staff would need to collect data
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## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method 1: On-Site, In-Person Admin by Advocate</th>
<th>Method 2: Telephone Follow-Up by Advocate</th>
<th>Method 3: On-Site, Client Self-Admin</th>
<th>All Methods Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of eligible clients served by program</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who completed evaluation</td>
<td>15 (88%)</td>
<td>3 (17%)</td>
<td>7 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 (48%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

- Collected data on clients' perceptions of methods
- All three methods were well-received by clients
- Differential response rate is NOT due to client preferences for a particular method
Results

- Explored whether clients rated the services they received differently by method
- No difference in the clients' answers to the evaluation questions as a function of method
Why Differential Response Rate?

- Why is Method 2 so low?
- Reflects challenges of doing follow-up with HTF-T-V for either program purposes or evaluation
- On-site data collection is key
Why Differential Response Rate?

• Why difference between Method 1 and 3?
• If you give tired, traumatized people the option to privately opt out, many will
• Asking questions directly is key
Take Home Message

- But it is possible to do evaluation with HTF-T-V population
- Collect data on-site and ask directly
- But with HTF-T-V populations, evaluators may not be able to do data collection directly
- SO, work with program staff to decide when, where, and how to do evaluation data collection