



CHIS 2019-2020 Teen Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting Summary

Date: February 26, 2018

Chair: Claire Brindis, DrPH

Director, Philip R. Lee Institute for Health Policy Studies

University of California, San Francisco

These notes are a summary of the meeting presentations and discussions. The content of the presentation slides is not repeated verbatim, but the slide numbers and topics are provided for reference. The complete slide set is on the TAC website in the original format and in a printer friendly format.

Teen TAC website link: <http://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chis/tac2019/Pages/Adolescent-TAC.aspx>

Welcome and Introduction:

Claire Brindis opened the meeting by welcoming everyone. Todd Hughes took roll-call of meeting participants.

CHIS 2015 – 2016 Data Dissemination Update (slide 3)

Todd reviewed changes that were implemented in 2015-16, here are a few of the noteworthy ones:

- Addition of discrimination experiences in the healthcare setting
- Birth control method used by women aged 18-44
- Reinstated questions about mammography exams
- Pregnancy status
- Gender identity questions
- Reason for recent dental visit and overall condition of teeth
- For more details about the overview of changes on the 2015-2016 questionnaire, please visit this link: <http://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chis/design/Documents/whats-new-chis-2015-2016.pdf>

2015 Data Collection Results (slide 5)

The data collection results from 2015 were on target with our goals with over 21,000 completed adult interviews, over 700 adolescent interviews and over 2,100 child interviews. In 2016, the results were quite similar, and CHIS fully implemented interviews in Asian languages as well. In 2016 there were greater numbers of completed interviews in Asian and Latino languages but both years were comparable.

CHIS 2017-18 Data Collection Update (slide 7)

In 2017, CHIS conducted a competitive selection process for a new data collection subcontractor, and SSRS was chosen. SSRS is located outside of Philadelphia, PA and is led by David Dutwin. David Dutwin is also the president-elect of the American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR). SSRS completed the 2017 interviews in December and were successful in meeting our targets.

CHIS 2017-2018 Sample Highlights (slide 9)

The 2017-2018 sample had the same geographic stratification of past CHIS cycles, there was a 50/50 split of cell and landline samples. There was no additional promised incentives for cell phone samples but we still sent 1 pre-notification letter with \$2 bill. However, we are experimenting with eliminating the pre-notification letter altogether given the high volume of mailings that go out and we have decided to do an experiment to see the cost effectiveness of doing it or not. We oversampled Korean and Vietnamese households, as well as San Diego County and Imperial County.

Recent CHIS Sample Sizes (slide 10)

In 2017 our minimum goal was 20,000 interviews, and we met that goal with around 21,000 interviews. There is a downward trend in completed adolescent interviews and for the percentage of teen interviews completed per adult completed interview. Additionally the child interview yield was lower in 2017 than in previous years. The rates look higher in 2018 for the teen and child interviews but one shouldn't infer much from that we have had more success in interviewing those two groups.

CHIS 2017-18 Content Changes (slides 11-20)

Nicole Lordi presented the content changes for CHIS 2017-18. Red font indicates deleted content and green font indicates added content. Some of the content will explicitly say that it was changed only during 2018. Otherwise, it was changed for both 2017 and 2018 CHIS cycles.

Exploring a CHIS Redesign (slide 21)

Todd briefed the group about declining response rates overall. Declines in cooperation by telephone have significantly impacted the cost-effectiveness of the current RDD design. We question the long term-viability of a telephone survey design and seek better or more efficient ways of conducting the survey. By nature, the RDD frame is not directly linked to small geographic areas, which makes it difficult for targeting geographies. This in turn is a disadvantage for our Small Area Estimation methodology for AskCHIS NE.

Goals of the Redesign Working Group (RWG) (slide 23)

We wanted to assemble a group of external survey methodology and subject matter experts to evaluate where CHIS can improve and innovate to achieve its mission. The group evaluated different modes that we can use to supplement or totally replace what we currently have. We also convened this group to review and refine research plans to conduct a frame/mode field experiment. Kaiser was kind enough to fund our working group experiment.

Pilot Experiment Key Priorities (slide 24)

1. Determine a less expensive way to collect CHIS data while improving (or maintaining) quality
 - a. Many surveys switched from RDD design to a push to web survey. Very cost effective and is a general improvement from phone interviews.
 - b. Has had growing success in other large-scale population surveys
 - c. Web is often found to be the least expensive data collection mode
 - d. However, respondents of web surveys tend to be biased toward younger, more literate, more educated, those with internet access and more efficient in English.
 - e. It would not be wise to do a push to web method alone because it could lead to the sample being biased toward certain demographics/factors, so it would be best to include the push to web method along with other methods
2. Complete Coverage
 - a. Gaps left by ABS with Web (e.g. no web access)
 - b. We should consider multiple frames and modes in order to get full coverage
3. Racial/Language Representation
 - a. We looked hard for different ways other surveys have had success with self-administered modes like web but were not able to find it
 - b. We have decided to retain some sort of telephone/CATI component. We are looking to maintain and expand CATI surname list frame. Currently we are only using Chinese, Korean, or Vietnamese languages. We are looking to expand that surname list to include Spanish surname, or Spanish language flags
4. Teens and Children
 - a. Web survey respondents tend to be biased toward younger households, and those younger households are more likely to have children and teens so that could be a benefit to us
 - b. There are a few surveys that have tried to solve the problem of low response rates from children and teen but the group found few examples of successful strategies
 - c. We propose to experiment with various teen recruitment methods including text and email

Propose Pilot Design (slide 29)

Brian Wells kicked off this segment with a proposal for a mixed mode data collection. We are focusing on a mail invitation followed up with a web survey, which we will be supplementing with a surname list. We will be restricting the web based instrument to English language only, but non-native speakers will be able to call-in to complete a CATI interview in their native language. We will be contacting teens via email and text messages (with parental permission).

The mail invitation to web survey will include survey login with \$2 bill pre-incentive. It will also include a multilingual information sheet with call-in instructions. We will also be experiencing within household approaches to ensure randomness. We will follow up with sealed postcards.

They will then receive a second invitation to the web survey. We will experiment with different types of packaging to see what people will have more positive responses to. After the second invitation, remaining sample will be telephone matched. If matched, household will receive 10 CATI call attempts. For those households with eligible teens, we will ask the adults to provide the teen's phone number with specific request to text the teen. We will not be collecting email or cell numbers of teens when the adult interview was completed by telephone.

If the adult provides permission to text the teen, the teen receives a text invitation to web survey, a text reminder with email invitation (with permission), mail invitation to home address and an attempt at a phone interview (with permission).

If the adult provides permission to email only, we will email the teen with an invitation. If the teen does not respond to that we will send them an email reminder, a mail invitation to their home address and finally attempt to interview them over the phone (with permission).

If the adult does not provide an email address or cell number, we will send a mail invitation to the home address, followed by a mail reminder, and finally follow up with CATI collection using the household phone number if available.

Sample design for pilot experiment (slide 36)

We are focusing on three selected counties: LA, Santa Clara and Tulare. We selected these counties based on multiple factors, we hope to do about 200 interviews per county with 10 weeks of data collection in Spring/Summer 2018

CHIS 2019-2020 Content Planning (slide 39)

Royce reviewed the content development timeline. We will be forming workgroups around the topics introduced in the TAC meetings in February 2018. We will begin data collection for the English version of the questionnaire in January 2019 and non-English questionnaire will be in Feb – Mar 2019. **The deadline for deciding on the 2019 questionnaire content is June 30, 2018.**

Criteria for Adding/Removing Content (slide 42)

Nicole Lordi reviewed CHIS content criteria. CHIS content should address the public health issues that are the most relevant to the population. If the topic has been used in CHIS before, we need to ask

- How often it has been collected
- How quickly is change likely to be measurable
- Can it be measured in a short amount of time?
- Is there a likely or definite funder for the topic?

Funding Considerations (slide 43)

We encourage open thinking on potential new questionnaire topics, but we do not want the questionnaire to be too long and we also need to make sure that proposed questions are matched to ideas for likely or potential funders to fund the content.

CHIS Workgroup Formation (slide 44)

Formed as needed to recommend specific content that is appropriate for the current survey mode. The frequency of the meetings of the work group would depend on the content of the workgroup.

Potential CHIS 2019 Workgroups (slide 45)

The main potential work group needs identified prior to the TAC meetings for this year are:

- Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity
- Marijuana and Opioid Use
- Caregiving
- Oral Health

Current Content and Emerging Health Issues: CHIS 2019-2020 Potential Topics Discussion (slide 46)

This section reviewed the survey content by section. Questionnaire content can be viewed on the Teen TAC website (<http://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chis/tac2019/Pages/Adolescent-TAC.aspx>), along with the questionnaires from past cycles.

Review and Action Steps

Ninez concluded the meeting by thanking all the participants for their insights and suggestions. We will be following-up with participants regarding workgroups.

TAC Questions, Answers, Comments and Suggestions

Pilot Experiment

Q: How much would sending the email reminder help if you already have their number that you can call and text them with? – Elizabeth Ozer

A: We are not sure, but we are going to try to see how it goes. However, we will send the email along with the text reminder was the approach

Suggestion: Collect data methodically in order to contribute to the literature on methods for teen data collection. – Claire Brindis

Q: Will all of these pilot respondents be included in the 2018 final data? - Brendan Darsie

A: No, we are not planning to include the experimental design data with the final data, it is more for comparing how well the experiment did vs the CHIS 2018 data

Workgroups

Workgroup suggestions from Teen TAC:

- ***DACA status, technology, gun violence, expanding e-cigarette use, option for latinx should be considered***

Q: Are you looking for volunteers for the workgroups? – Claire Brindis

A: Yes we are interested in looking for workgroup volunteers/ chairs and/or new topics for future workgroups. The meetings are taking place in March/April.

Current Content and Emerging Health Issues CHIS 2019-2020

Q: What CHIS will do about the gender section? Will it incorporate gender identity for teens? – Diem Tran

A: The SOGI (Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity) workgroup will tackle this issue, in the past we have not included the two-part gender identity question for the teen.

Q: Measures of housing instability, homelessness, has it been brought up as an important demographic variable? –Bianca Wilson

A: This is something we have raised to one of our funders, we have proposed a whole module on this topic for the adult questionnaire.

Suggestion: Other types of questions regarding violence outside of “fighting,” need to have a workgroup on gun violence –Claire Brindis

Suggestion: Has anyone looked at shaming others from doing physical activity? Bianca Wilson

Suggestion: On the e-cigarette use, we might look at how teens perceive vaping these days. – Elizabeth Ozer

Q: What about time alone with provider? –Claire Brindis

A: We do not ask about time alone. In past cycles we have asked about the teen’s ability to contact a provider on their own.

Suggestion: Consider cycling off questions on care coordination, as teens are not likely to easily answer those questions, and replace with question on time alone with provider, as this is an important national level indicator of confidentiality – Claire Brindis

Q: Diem Tran: For the health care utilization section, does it assess how respondents get to their appointments (maybe this could fall under transportation)?

A: Transportation is listed as a response to receiving a delay in care.

Suggestion: How the mode of transportation distributed among the teens, if they drive, if their parents drive, or if they take public transportation etc. – Diem Tran

Suggestion: Contraceptive questions are being framed around pregnancy prevention, but maybe have it also be framed around STD prevention –Laura Kovalesky

Q: Is it worthwhile asking DACA status in the citizenship portion? – Claire Brindis

A: We had a question for two years that was funded where we asked about visa status. The non-response was relatively high (35-45%). We haven’t thought specifically about asking about DACA status. It was only on the adult population.

Q: Do you think there is any potential for funders to increase the number/focus of technology questions? – Elizabeth Ozer

A: Ninez would be happy to work with a workgroup, but currently we do not have a funder for those questions for 2019.

Suggestion: Cyber-bullying is another issue that it would seem important to include in the teen survey. - Brendan Darsie

Comment: “I feel like overall, the survey covers important questions that are relevant to adults, children and adolescents” – Claire Brindis

Suggestion: Option for latinx should be in the questionnaire – Diem Tran

Suggestion: Some questions will have low prevalence, and then the utility is questionable given the small sample sizes. Consider that carefully when considering whether to add or drop questions. –Sue Babey

Suggestion: Temper decisions on forming work groups based on likely potential for funding for the proposed topic. –Claire Brindis