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Overview of Evaluating Surveillance Systems

**Learning Objectives**

- Using a sample evaluation report of a noncommunicable disease (NCD) surveillance system, identify how the components were described and evaluated.

**Estimated Completion Time**

- 120 minutes (90 minutes interactive presentation; 30 minute skill assessment)

**References and Resources**

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Updated guidelines for evaluating public health surveillance systems: recommendations from the guidelines working group. MMWR 2001;50(No. RR-13).
### Module Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Learning Objective

Using a sample evaluation report of a noncommunicable disease (NCD) surveillance system, identify how the components were described and evaluated.

#### Lesson Overview

- Why evaluate surveillance systems
- CDC Evaluation Framework
- Example of an evaluation of a surveillance system

#### Importance of Evaluating Surveillance Systems
Why is it Important to Evaluate?

- Produce recommendations in order to improve:
  - Efficiency
  - Quality
  - Effectiveness
  - Usefulness
  - Cost

When is an Evaluation Effective?

- An evaluation is effective when...
  - It is useful, feasible, advisable and precise.
  - The information can be used in decision-making and allocation of resources.
  - It contributes information in order to generate lines of research.
  - It meets the performance standards.

Who is Interested in Evaluation Results?

- Users
- Staff members
- Policy makers
- General public
- Communications media
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Objectives

- Stakeholders
- System description
- Evaluation design
- Credible evidence
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons learned

Step 1 – Engage Stakeholders

- Stakeholders are people and/or organizations that are:
  - Interested in the program.
  - Interested in the results of the evaluation, and/or
  - Have a stake in what will be done with the results of the evaluation.

Stakeholders

- CDC Arthritis Program
- National organizations
- State and local health departments
- Public health policymakers
- Healthcare professionals
- The public
Step 2 – Describe the Surveillance System

Describe Surveillance System to Be Evaluated
1. Importance in public health
2. Purpose and operation
3. Resources used

Describe Surveillance System: Step 1
1. Importance in public health
   a) Indices of frequency
   b) Indices of severity
   c) Disparities or inequities associated with the health-related event
   d) Costs associated with the health-related event
   e) Preventability
   f) Potential future clinical course in the absence of intervention
   g) Public interest
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System Description: Public Health Importance of Arthritis

- An estimated 49.9 million (22.2%) cases of doctor-diagnosed arthritis among adults. 1 Conservative estimate.

- Approximately 21.1 million have arthritis-attributable activity limitations (AAAL).
  - 9.1% of adults overall
  - 42.4% of arthritis cases

- $128 billion (1.2% of GDP). 2


Public Health Importance of Arthritis

- Demographic, anthropomorphic, medical, and lifestyle differences in arthritis prevalence 1
  - Higher in women (24.3%) vs. men (18.2%)
  - Higher among older population
  - Higher among whites (23.0%) vs. Blacks (21.7%) and Hispanics (20.5%)
  - Obesity is associated with arthritis


Describe Surveillance System: Step 2

2. Purpose and operation
   a) Purpose and objectives of system
   b) Planned uses of data from system
   c) Health-related event under surveillance, including case definition
   d) Legal authority for data collection
   e) The organization(s) where system resides
   f) Level of integration with other systems, if appropriate
   g) Flow chart of system
   h) Components of system
Describe Surveillance System: Step 2, Part H

h) Components of system
1. Population under surveillance
2. Period of time of data collection
3. Data collection
4. Reporting sources of data
5. Data management
6. Data analysis and dissemination
7. Patient privacy, data confidentiality, and system security
8. Records management program

Purpose of Arthritis Surveillance System Using Data from NHIS

- Estimate magnitude of arthritis burden
- Interpret data
- Make recommendations

Operation of NHIS

- NHIS surveillance system
  - Annual
  - Household interview
  - Conducted by National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS)
- NHIS design
  - Stratified, multi-stage
  - Probability design
  - Oversampling of minorities
Operation of Arthritis Surveillance within NHIS

- 6 core questions
  - Arthritis prevalence
  - AAAL

- 5 optional questions
  - Joint Pain
  - Arthritis Attributable Work Limitations (AAWL)
  - Arthritis Management
    - Losing weight
    - Exercise
    - Educational course

Describe Surveillance System: Step 3

3. Resources used
   a) Funding sources
   b) Personnel requirements
   c) Other resources

Resources for Arthritis Surveillance within NHIS

- Core arthritis questions
  - No cost

- Optional arthritis questions
  - $600,000
  - Split evenly among CDC and NIH
Step 3 – Focus the Evaluation Design

1. Determine the specific purpose of the evaluation
2. Identify stakeholders who will receive findings and recommendations
3. Consider how information will be used
4. Specify questions to be answered by evaluation
5. Determine standards to assessing performance of system

Evaluation Design

• Comprehensive review of CDC Arthritis Program
• Information obtained
  • Discussing with key informants
  • Reviewing data sources and results
• Evaluation will focus on single case definition
  • “Have you ever been told by a doctor or other health care professional that you have some form of arthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, gout, lupus, or fibromyalgia?”
Step 4 – Gather Credible Evidence

Gather Credible Evidence Phases
1. Indicate the level of usefulness
2. Describe each system attribute

When is a Surveillance System Useful?
- Detects the events under surveillance
- Presents estimates on magnitude of event
- Detects trends, changes in occurrence
- Contributes to the prevention and control of the monitored events
- Promotes research
- Identifies measures of performance
**System Attributes**
- Simplicity
- Flexibility
- Data quality
- Acceptability
- Sensitivity
- Predictive value positive
- Representativeness
- Timeliness
- Stability

**How Can You Evaluate Simplicity?**
- Type and quantity of data to identify occurrence of the event
- Data collection methods
- Methods for handling data
- Methods of analyzing and disseminating data
- Integration with other surveillance systems and information
- Steps to process the report of the event
- Flow of the data: average time between steps and transfer of data
- Who analyzes data and how

**How Can You Evaluate Flexibility?**
- Response of the system to new demands
- Analysis of design and flow of system
- Capacity to respond to information needs
Credible Evidence: Usefulness, Simplicity and Flexibility

• Usefulness: Arthritis case definition has been validated

• Simplicity: Standardized questions and survey methodology

• Flexibility: NHIS flexible for changes in case definition of arthritis if needed. From 1996 to 2001 case definition included chronic joint symptoms. Case definition changed in 2001 to current version after conducting two validation studies.

How Can You Evaluate Data Quality?

• Identify percentage of responses that have “do not know” or are blank

• Compare registered data with the real values

• Determine fulfillment of standards

Data Quality: Validation Study #1

• Compared validity of self-reported doctor-diagnosed arthritis to self-reported chronic joint symptoms

• 389 Subjects from a Massachusetts clinic aged 45-64 years (N=179) and aged ≥65 years (N=210)

• Telephone interview followed by clinic interview

• Rheumatologist diagnosed arthritis was gold standard

• Aged 45-64: Self-report of doctor diagnosed arthritis was more specific than chronic joint (79% vs. 67%)

• Aged ≥65: Similar specificity and sensitivity

• Specificity higher for older group

http://www.nhid.org/DrDerksenReport/Chapter4.pdf


**Data Quality: Validation Study #2**

- Compared: validity and reliability of self-reported doctor-diagnosed arthritis to self-reported chronic joint symptoms.
- A convenience sample of 887 participants from Georgia aged ≥60 years. Telephone survey followed by medical examination.
- Rheumatologist diagnosed arthritis was gold standard.
- Specificity and sensitivity similar. Combining case definitions led to low specificity (58.1%) and low sensitivity.
- Reliability very high for doctor-diagnosed (κ=0.88) compared to chronic joint symptoms (κ=0.44).

---

**How Can You Evaluate Acceptability**

- Obtain percentage of:
  - Subject participation
  - Complete forms
  - Questions rejected

---

**How Can You Evaluate Sensitivity**

- Estimate the proportion of the total number of cases in the population under surveillance being detected by the system.
- Measuring sensitivity requires:
  - Collection of or access to data to determine the true frequency of the condition in the population under surveillance
  - Validation of the data collected by the system.
How Can You Evaluate Predictive Value Positive?
- Confirm number of cases reported by the system
- Identify number of false positives
- Identify effects of the PVP on use of resources in public health

How Can You Evaluate Representativeness?
- Compare the presence of the characteristic in the population with the presence of the characteristic in sample population
- Can be examined through special studies in a case sample

Acceptability and Representativeness
- Acceptability is high
- Estimated response rate for NHIS 90%
- Question Refusal Rate low (0.04%)
- Representative of the adult civilian non-institutionalized population in the U.S.
How Can You Evaluate Timeliness?

- Examine the speed between steps in a public health surveillance system
- For chronic diseases: evaluate the elapsed time from diagnosis rather than date of symptom onset
- Assess the availability of information for immediate control efforts or long-term program planning

How Can You Evaluate Stability?

- Measure:
  - Frequency of system outages
  - Downtime for servicing during periods of need
  - Frequency of personnel deficiencies from staff turnover
  - Downtime of data providers
  - Budget constraints

Timeliness and Stability

- Data is made available in a timely manner an estimated 6 months after survey completion.
- If requested NHIS data can be made available after 3 months.
- NHIS has been established since 1957.
- Arthritis case definition has not changed since 2001.
Step 5 – Justify Conclusions

Justify Conclusions

- State whether or not the surveillance system is addressing an important health problem.
- Explain if the surveillance system is meeting its objectives.
- Recommendations should address the continuation and/or modification of the surveillance system.

Conclusions and Recommendations

- Current case definition for arthritis should remain in NHIS
- Case definition has been validated in two studies
- Specificity and reliability is high
- Make optional questions mandatory and annual
Step 6 – Ensure Use and Share Lessons Learned

- Engage stakeholders
- Describe the surveillance system
- Focus the evaluation design
- Gather credible evidence
- Justify conclusions
- Ensure use and share lessons learned

Ensure Use and Share Lessons Learned Questions

- How can you ensure use of the evaluation?
- How can you communicate findings and recommendations from the evaluation?

Lessons Learned

- Prior case definition has low specificity and reliability
- CDC arthritis program recommended lowering burden of false positive arthritis diagnoses at the expense of more false negatives.
- Arthritis has a high prevalence in the population therefore a specific case definition would capture a high percentage of true positives.
- More accurate annual arthritis prevalence can be estimated
Skill Assessment

Activity

Instructions:
- You will work in small groups to complete the skill assessment.
- Your group will read a report about an evaluation of a surveillance system and answer the questions below.
- Spend no more than 30 minutes completing the assessment.
- Be prepared to share your work with the rest of the class.

Answer the following questions:
1. What stakeholders did the evaluator include in the report?

2. Which tasks and sub-tasks under step 2 (System Description) did the evaluator include in the evaluation report?

3. Which tasks and sub-tasks under step 2 did the evaluator omit but should have included? Please explain.
4. How did the evaluator describe the components of the system (step 2, item h)?

5. How did the evaluator describe the system resources?

6. For step 3 (Focus the Design), which tasks did the evaluator describe? Which tasks did the evaluator omit but should have included?

7. How did the evaluator describe

8. evaluate the following?

   - usefulness:

   - simplicity:
- flexibility:

- data quality:

- acceptability:

- sensitivity:

- predictive value positive:

- representativeness:

- timeliness:

- stability:

9. Summarize the evaluation recommendations and lessons learned in the space below.

10. How would you recommend that the evaluator ensure use of evaluation findings?