**Evaluating the effectiveness of routine outcome monitoring feedback**

* Q1: Did the implementation of the new feedback system improve outcomes?
  + Compare outcomes at centers before and after they implemented
  + Mention in the introduction/discussion that there are other unmeasured impacts feedback system can have. If there isn’t a measurable impact on outcome, that doesn’t mean that it wasn’t beneficial and worthwhile. sSense of ownership on the part of the clinician in the PRN process (providing feedback to CCMH and seeing that change made, sense that their voice is being respected).
  + Rate of change? % deterioration? # of sessions?
* Q2: Do clients’ trajectories change after receiving feedback?
  + Data cleaning
    - Include two years of data before profile report was introduced (2013-2015), and two years of data two years after the profile report was introduced (2017-2019)
      * This addresses the newness effect and allows them to become familiar with the new profile report
      * Only include centers that are present in all four of those years
    - Only include clients who alerted or would have alerted
    - Remove clients below low cut?
    - Minimum number of sessions?
    - Exclude clients who alerted late in treatment?
  + Analyses
    - Piecewise longitudinal model evaluating whether the slope of a client’s change differs before and after their first alert, or the first session they would have alerted (Amble, Gude, Ulvenes, et al., 2015; Probst et al., 2013).
    - Center each client’s data around the session at which they first alerted or would have alerted
    - Intercept represents their CCAPS score when they alerted
    - Coding options for testing the impact of feedback- need to investigate further to decide which to use
      * Contrast code sessions before and after first alert to compare slopes (0, 1)
      * Two codes for slope (0, 1, 2, 3, 4 & 0, 0, 1, 2, 3)
      * Splines
    - Include a code for whether they were seen before or after the feedback system was released and an interaction with the feedback variable above
* Q3: What moderates how effective feedback is?
  + Client moderators
    - Mental health history items
    - Frequency of CCAPS administration
    - Total number of sessions
    - When in treatment the first alert occurs
    - Number of alerts a client receives
    - Variability in client’s scores
      * Are alerts more effective for stable or unstable clients?
    - Whether the client was in other treatment modalities besides individual therapy
    - Their therapist’s caseload
    - Number of other clients a therapist saw the day the alert happened

**Methods notes**

* We don’t know exactly when centers updated to the new profile report. The report was released on 7/27/15, so it can’t be before that.
  + If the date is on or after 7/27/15, use that date. If the date is before 7/27/15, use 7/27/15. This is not 100% certain however.
  + **Maybe more certain to use a year of data before update and most recent year. Any issues with this?**
    - **It may take a while for the impact of feedback system to manifest as therapists learn to use it and become accustomed to it.**
* How many years of data before and after update to use?
  + **2**
* What outcomes to compare before and after update?
  + Raw change? **Rate of change? % deterioration? # of sessions?**
    - Ask Ben what he was hoping for with the new profile report
* Match clients before and after that would have alerted and compare outcomes for those clients?
  + What characteristics to match on besides initial severity bin?
* Unmeasured mediators
  + Consistency of viewing CCAPS profiles
  + Feelings that CCAPS/ROM is imposed top down on them
  + See Kim’s work on climate’s impact on effect of ROM
* Look into org psych for relevant studies
* Therapist effect
  + Does effectiveness of feedback vary by therapist
  + Does effectiveness differ based on whether a therapist used the old report or not