

Privileged and Confidential
Response Required at the Request of Counsel

Consultant Name: _____

We are contacting you and your firm again at the request of our client for an expert opinion and analysis regarding a matter on which they would prefer to act soon. Thank you for your analysis proposal. After careful consideration of many different firms and experts, we have decided to proceed with you based upon your reputation and your submitted work plan. Congratulations.

Below, we have restated our client's concerns that we described for you previously. Upon discussion, we and our client agree that there are several other analytical issues which would help us with the presentation of our case. We request your help on these as well. Please provide for us a thorough and well written report which provides the results of your analysis of the matters of interest and the related data. As is common practice here at the firm, your work will be audited. We have found that a standard report format makes this reviewing process as straightforward as possible. Formatting guidelines can be found at the end of this document. Thank you for your time, and we look forward to seeing and reviewing your analysis.

Previously stated concern:

Recently in 2014, in order to save on emergency preparedness and response costs, our state government contracted a third party company, Respond2Emergencies, to train response teams in each of our state's fourteen counties. Respond2Emergencies was established over five years ago with a training facility centrally located in the middle of our state. Their promotional materials have stated for years that they pride themselves on "providing top notch and consistent emergency preparedness training" for all of their customers.

Respond2Emergencies recently began offering a *We Come to You* service. Rather than travel to the central training facility, a customer could stay home, and Respond2Emergencies would send a training team to them for training. Respond2Emergencies charges the same for training no matter whether the training is conducted at the training facility or through the *We Come to You* service.

This additional service was instrumental in our government's decision to use Respond2Emergencies to train the emergency response teams in each county (a government cost analysis had previously found that it was too expensive for the six counties farthest from the central training facility to send their respective teams to the facility for training). For these six counties, a travel team from Respond2Emergencies went to each county's largest banquet hall and trained each county's response team separately from the rest. Contrastingly, the teams from the eight closest counties traveled to the central training facility and were all trained on the same day in one large group.

- Our client is concerned that Respond2Emergencies did not live up to the claims of their promotional materials for the six counties which received training via the *We Come to You* service. Our client is worried the six outlying counties are not as adequately prepared for an emergency as the eight counties that attended the onsite group session. Moreover, there is the concern that the teams from these six counties were all trained differently from each other, whereas the onsite trained teams are all trained similarly.
- **The government administered a test to each team to assess how well they would be prepared in the event of a future emergency. Each of the fourteen teams completed the test and has a score for the test. These data are provided below:**

2014 *Emergency Preparedness Test Scores*

Location	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Onsite Counties	85.34	84.12	86.53	85.52	84.61	86.94	84.05	86.29
<i>We Come to You</i> Counties	81.48	81.26	79.71	81.46	79.20	81.65	-	-

As mentioned above, we have determined further analytical concerns which we would like you to address.

We have become aware that our state government has been issuing an Emergency Preparedness Test for years now. Moreover, we have similarly found out that the five surrounding states have issued the same test for many years as well. Up until 2014, these states, as well as our own, provided emergency preparedness training by sending out training materials to all respective counties.

- As all counties in each state received the same materials, the preparedness tests were administered only at state, not county, level of specificity. These data are all public; we provide them in the tab-delimited dataset “State Test Data.txt”. Unfortunately, due to record keeping mishaps not only do we not know from which years individual scores come, but we have a different number of scores for each state. In an attempt to establish how our state government has managed (or mismanaged) our state’s preparedness process for years, we would like to know if our state’s preparedness materials have in general resulted in a different level of preparedness than the surrounding states. We assume that training for each respective state has been consistent over the years since the same materials for each state have gone out every year for well over a decade and a half. We would also be interested in knowing if there are differences in general among the states, and where and how those differences occur between states.

We also would like to address a specific claim made by Respond2Emergencies regarding their *We Come to You* service. They have claimed that if a client is unsatisfied with the travel training service results, it may just be because the training instructors did not spend enough time with the client offsite. They have said that their research shows that the more time their offsite instructors spend with a client, the better prepared the client becomes. However reasonable this may seem, feedback from some of those who attended the *We Come to You* training sessions indicates that this may not be true. Apparently, the instructors spent a great deal of the workshop chatting with each other, goofing off, or otherwise wasting time.

- We have been provided with internal research data from a Respond2Emergencies employee. These data are from several test groups, sets of whom received *We Come to You* training sessions of different lengths. Each group received a test comparable to the government’s Emergency Preparedness Test to assess the efficacy of the training. We have been told this data is authentic and was legally obtained and shared with us. We have court sanctioned permission to share this data for the purpose of forensic analysis with you and your firm. This data is contained in the “Internal Research - WCTY Time Data.txt” tab delimited dataset. Please analyze and comment on Respond2Emergencies’ claims.

Please provide an analysis addressing the concerns of our client on this matter. Please describe any statistical tests you perform, including a short description of the basic steps and logic associated with them. Though we do not need to get into every tiny detail of each test, please give us enough information so that we can understand their basic structures and theory behind them. Please provide conclusions in the context of the concerns with clear explanations.

- Additionally, as our client was not fully clear with your explanations before, please respond to the following question:

“Can’t we just do t -tests on all of these data to figure out what is going on in each of these situations? Why do we have to pay a consulting firm that specializes in nonparametric statistics? What is the general difference between nonparametric and parametric analytical methods anyway?”

Report Format:

- Introduction (respond to our client's t -test and why non-parametric questions here)
- Summary of data for analysis
- Discussion of statistical tests or methodology to be used and why, including discussion of assumptions if they are required to perform any mentioned test
- Results of applications of statistical tests to respective data
- Discussion of results
- Conclusion and summarizing remarks
- Software/Code Appendix