

4. Administration Quality Assurance in GAIN Administration

4.1 What does “A-QA” mean?

In this context, administration quality assurance, or A-QA, is a process that consists of monitoring an interviewer’s skills at administering an assessment protocol and providing evaluative feedback. Once the interviewer’s skills reach a predetermined level of competence, the interviewer is “certified” in GAIN administration. Administration A-QA can also continue after certification to monitor ongoing adherence to protocol.

4.2 How does the A- QA process work?

The point about being trained and practiced before initiating the A-QA process is significant. Too often interviewers attempt to start the A-QA process, attempting to get certified in GAIN assessment administration, before they have had sufficient training and practice. This results in a longer, drawn-out A-QA process. It is suggested that, as part of training, the interviewer observes several assessment administrations before doing practice runs on her own. Once familiar and comfortable with the instrument, the A-QA process should begin.

Although it may be up to your clinical supervisor, project leaders, or funders whether quality assurance of assessment administrations will take place, we strongly recommend it, both for the initial certification of interviewers as well as for ongoing protocol monitoring. Interviewers vary widely both in terms of their prior experience and their interactive styles. For instance, some interviewers may be totally new to conducting assessments, some may have experience with interviewing adults but not adolescents, and even seasoned interviewers may have picked up less-than-optimal interviewing habits or their skills may have deteriorated over time. Because the quality of an assessment administration can affect the validity of the data, we are strong believers in setting up an ongoing quality assurance program as part of interviewer training. The size of the FAQ document alone indicates that questions on administering items in the GAIN are common, so having a program in place to support the quality of assessment administration is important. Because much of our work in quality assurance is done for distant sites, we typically use audio recordings for protocol monitoring and provide feedback either orally or in writing (though most often in writing).

Our A-QA model for quality assurance requires that first a trainee attend a national training (train the trainer) event. After training, the trainee submits audio-recorded submissions to Chestnut and receives written feedback. This process continues until mastery level is reached (see below for details). After reaching Administration certification, the Local Trainer candidate trains her own staff and uses our model to give feedback to their staff and follows a process with us to get certified as a Local Trainer. A certified Local Trainer can then choose their own model of A-QA for their staff. This may consist of use of the GCC’s feedback model, written feedback using a different for than the one we use, or in-person feedback (or a combination of the three). Chapter 8 in the GAIN manual provides information on the specifics of the certification process.

Below are two sample models for certified Local Trainers to consider when deciding how to conduct A-QA for their agency or research project. The advantages and disadvantages of each are included.

Sample A-QA model #1 – Audio-recorded monitoring and written feedback

This model is useful when the person conducting the A-QA reviews is not located at the same facility as the interviewer (such as when overseeing A-QA for distant project sites). It also works well with interviewers who may be negatively influenced by live monitoring as well as with a staff member new to assessment administration who may benefit from detailed documentation of feedback.

- 1) Once trained and practiced, the interviewer records the administration of an assessment from start to finish.
- 2) The interviewer submits the tape or electronic recording and a hard copy of the assessment documentation to whomever will be doing the A-QA review (called the “A-QA reviewer” in this and the next sample model).
- 3) The A-QA reviewer evaluates the audio-recorded administration and documentation using a predetermined set of specific criteria. These criteria are used to base judgments of quality.
- 4) The A-QA reviewer writes specific, behavioral, evaluative feedback for the interviewer on the quality of the assessment. Feedback should conform to the predetermined set of criteria.
- 5) Based on the quality of the interview, the interviewer may be “pending” or “certified” in the assessment administration. If pending, the steps above are repeated (taping → evaluation → feedback) until the assessment is of sufficient quality to merit certification. After each A-QA audio-recorded review, the interviewer incorporates the A-QA reviewer’s feedback into their next assessment.
- 6) Once certified, the interviewer provides recordings on a maintenance schedule, perhaps taping one to two assessments per month for review and feedback by the A-QA reviewer. (At this point in the process, either oral or written feedback works well.) This is done to prevent the deterioration of assessment skills, or “interviewer drift.” A variation is to have interviewers record all their assessments from which the A-QA reviewer randomly chooses one or two each month for review and feedback. This process encourages interviewers to maintain quality assessment administrations through a psychological phenomena known as “reactivity” (one is on one’s best behavior when aware of being monitored).

Sample A-QA model #2 – Live monitoring and oral feedback

This model works well when the A-QA reviewer and interviewer are both on-site. It also works well with interviewers who are already experienced in assessment administration because the amount of feedback may not be as substantial or detailed.

- 1) Once trained and practiced, the interviewer conducts an assessment while the A-QA reviewer observes. The A-QA reviewer should be seated at a distance and in sight

primarily of the interviewer, not the participant; it is the interviewer who is being observed.

- 2) During the assessment administration, the A-QA reviewer records on a blank copy of the assessment a) the participant's answers and b) notes on the quality of the administration, following the predetermined criteria for conducting a quality assessment. Notes on the quality of the assessment could also be recorded directly on a sheet that lists the A-QA criteria, which will make feedback easier and more organized. The A-QA reviewer should refrain from interjecting comments during the assessment administration.
- 3) At the completion of the assessment, the A-QA reviewer provides specific, behavioral, evaluative oral feedback to the interviewer on the quality of the assessment. Feedback should conform to the predetermined set of criteria.
- 4) The interviewer then submits the hard copy of the assessment to the A-QA reviewer, who will (either at that time or later) review it against the copy that they recorded. This is a check on the accuracy of documentation. The A-QA reviewer provides the interviewer with oral feedback on the quality of the documentation (again, using a predetermined set of specific criteria).
- 5) Based on the quality of the assessment administration and documentation, the interviewer may be "pending" or "certified." If pending, the steps above are repeated (observing → evaluation → feedback) until the assessment is of sufficient quality to merit certification. After each A-QA review, the interviewer incorporates the A-QA reviewer's feedback into the next administration.
- 6) Once certified, the A-QA reviewer should continue to observe the interviewer's assessment administration, perhaps one to two times per month. As before, this is done to prevent interviewer drift.

4.3 What features do you look for when assessing the quality of an interview?

The essential features to focus on in GAIN administration are listed in a form called "GAIN Administration Quality Assurance Feedback Form," reproduced as attachment 4-1 at the end of this chapter.

Although feedback forms are used to review all forms of the GAIN, the specific criteria to use will vary slightly by the particular assessment; this is so because the various GAIN assessments are not identically structured. The feedback form conforms to the structure of the GAIN-I, version 5. Given that the criteria for use with the GAIN-I are comprehensive, the feedback form can easily be adapted for use with other GAIN assessments. Any criteria that are not applicable are coded "NA." There is also an A-QA feedback form tailored for the GAIN-Q instrument in the GAIN-Q administration and scoring manual (Titus & Dennis, 2003; available at http://www.chestnut.org/LI/gain/GAIN_Q/index.html.)

The GAIN-I feedback form is arranged in four main sections:

- Documentation
- Instructions
- Items
- Engagement

These four sections are assigned ratings in the feedback (detailed below). In addition, identifiers record ID and location of both the interviewer and the reviewer writing the feedback; an “other” section records notes and other feedback that don’t fit into the four main sections; and a certification status of pending or certified is assigned at the end of the feedback.

Each of the four major sections is further defined by specific criteria to apply to the assessment administration. (In defining the A-QA feedback sections and criteria, it is assumed that monitoring is done via audio recording and feedback is given in writing.)

Documentation – the recording of participant responses, clinical ratings, and identifying and administrative information. (The first four criteria are checked by consulting the hard copy of the assessment; the last three criteria require consulting the hard copy in concert with the audio recording.)

- **Cover page and staff use box on p. 2** (paper version) – Check that all appropriate fields are recorded. In the top box all fields down to and including Edit Staff ID and Edit Date are candidates for immediate completion (depending on your site’s needs). Pertinent fields in the Administration Information section on the back of the cover page should also be completed.
- **Documentation and scoring of Check for Cognitive Impairment** – This subsection is important because it documents whether an assessment should take place. Check that it is correctly documented. Any miscodes should be corrected on the hard copy and in the database.
- **Documentation of anchors, literacy questions, and initial administration decision** – Check that items A3a1 (past-90-days anchor), A3a2 (past-year anchor), A3b1-5 (literacy items), and A3c (initial administration decision) are documented.
- **Time to complete** – Check that information in section Z is complete and accurate.
- **Urgency and Denial-Misrepresentation ratings** – Check to see that these ratings, at the end of each major section of the GAIN-I, are complete and appear accurate. As you listen to the audio-recorded assessment, you will get a better idea as to the accuracy of these ratings. Be on the lookout for ratings that are consistently NO or NONE because it can be a sign that what the participant said was not attended to or reflected in the ratings.
- **Administration ratings** – Several pages in the back of the assessment contain a series of Administration Ratings (XADM), explained earlier in section 3.8. Check that the ratings are complete. A few may be predetermined by your site (e.g., MOA, LNG, and LOC). Note that MOA (mode of administration), OPB (observed participant behaviors), and PRI

(private environment) are the only items that can have more than one yes rating. As you listen to the audio-recorded assessment, you will get a better idea about the accuracy of the more qualitative ratings and whether there should be any additional comments noted in item XADMj. As noted earlier, XADMh1 and its subitems are filled out only when an administration takes place over more than one day.

- **Documentation of participant responses** – As you listen to the audio recording and go through the hard copy of the assessment, check the following points:
 - a) All items administered are documented correctly. Any miscodes should be corrected on the hard copy and in the database.
 - b) “DK” and “RF” are used correctly (covered earlier in section 3.1).
 - c) All responses are legible.
 - d) Errors are documented appropriately: the wrong answer is crossed out, the correct answer is recorded, and the initials of the person making the change and the date of the change are recorded.

Instructions – the explanations, directions, and transitional statements provided to the participant.

- **Introduction (purpose, format, length, privacy, confidentiality)** – Check that all parts (purpose, content, time, breaks, confidentiality) are clearly and completely presented. Paraphrasing in this section is okay as long as all parts are covered. (Paraphrasing directions can be fashioned to fit specific populations. See attachment 4-2 for an example appropriate for adolescents.)
- **Administration of Check for Cognitive Impairment** – Check that this is administered clearly and correctly.
- **Establishing time frames and anchors (main time frames and S2x)** – Check that this material is presented clearly. The interviewer should try to anchor the timeline with positive or neutral events.
- **Additional instructions for oral administration** – For oral administration, check that all parts are clearly and completely presented. Paraphrasing in this section is okay as long as all parts are covered. (See attachment 4-2 for an example that includes all required parts.) For self-administration check that all parts (types of questions, instructions with examples, documenting DK and RF, asking questions, break, any questions) are clearly and completely presented.
- **Reading scales and transitional statements** – Each major section of the GAIN starts with a brief explanation of that section and presents delimiting or defining information (e.g., defining the word “significant” at the beginning of the Mental Health section, distinguishing the participant between treatment for drug and alcohol use (S4-S7), health problems (P11), and psychological problems (M5)). Interviewers should include these statements during administration.
- **Using the cards and defining response choices** – Prior to starting a particular series of questions, the interviewer should introduce and define the response choices available,

using the appropriate card if there is one. For yes/no items the interviewer should simply ask the participant to answer yes or no.

- **Responding to participant questions about instructions** – Sometimes participants may not understand the instructions or introductory comments for a scale (e.g., they may constantly ask for repetition of instructions). Examples and definitions offered should be accurate and nonleading, and interviewers should remain patient while reexplaining material.

Items – the delivery and clarification of the items on the assessment.

- **Accurate following of item order and skips** – Check that items are delivered in the same order as on the assessment and all skips are followed correctly.
- **Accurate grid administration** – Comments about the interviewer’s administration and scoring of the grids are written up under this heading. Check to see that all required items were administered and that no required items were skipped. Make sure that the S2 and (if administered) S2x and S7 grids were administered correctly. Make sure that the interviewer administered only required items and substances in the S9 grid.
- **Accurate following of word order** – It is very easy to change the meaning of an item when the wording is changed. Minor changes in wording can be okay as long as they don’t change the meaning of an item; however, this is a slippery slope, and it is strongly suggested that items are read as written (with appropriate clarification if needed).
- **Appropriate use of stems and anchors** – Items often are introduced with a stem or time frame. Periodically, the interviewer should repeat the time frames, especially when a long list of subitems is included in the scale (e.g., M2, M3a, M4, L3a). In addition, periodic anchoring of the time frames using the personal events noted in the timeline should be offered.
- **Appropriate use of parenthetical statements** – Words in parentheses are optional, elaborative phrases that do not have to be read unless necessary, such as, for S2n, if the participant needs examples of substances that act as an antianxiety drug or a tranquilizer.
- **Clarification of participant responses for coding** – Sometimes participants will offer a response that is outside the set of defined response choices. Running through the available response choices, as mentioned previously, is one way to address this situation. Sometimes, though, further clarification of a response is necessary. For example, in response to a yes/no item, the participant may respond, “sometimes.” In these situations, it’s important that the interviewer clarifies the response with the participant without offering an answer. Saying “Would that be ‘yes’ or ‘no?’” or “So should I put ‘yes’ or ‘no?’” are two possible ways for the interviewer to respond.

Note that the interviewer is clarifying by offering both options (yes or no) rather than only one. It would not be appropriate to offer to the participant “So do you want to go with ‘yes’?” or to assume that the participant meant “yes” and circle that without asking for clarification. The responses need to come from the participant, not the interviewer. As a second example, for items that make use of response cards, if the participant offers a

response that is not one of the available responses on the card, clarify rather than assume: “So using this card, what would your answer be?” It typically only takes a few requests for clarification until the participant routinely responds within the set of available answers. As a third example, suppose in response to the item “During the past 90 days, on how many days did you...?” the participant says “about half the days.” If the interviewer responds with “45 days?” then they are asking for clarification, but their clarification also falls on the line of suggesting an answer. Better clarifying responses would be “So how many days would that be?” or “So how many days should I put?” If options are presented, present several rather than focusing on only one (“So would that be 30 days, 40 days, 50 days? More or less? What would you like me to put?” As a final example, when giving qualitative, open-ended answers, sometimes participants will offer sketchy responses. The interviewer should follow up with the participant, clarifying questions in order to get a response that clearly answers the question. The interviewer may understand what the participant meant, but someone else coming along to code qualitative answers may have no idea what was meant if only a few cryptic notes that don’t appear to answer the question are recorded.

- **Responding to participant questions about items** – As with the directions, sometimes participants do not understand the meaning of a word in an item or the meaning of an item altogether. In these situations, the interviewer should offer clear, accurate definitions or examples that do not lead the participant to answer in a particular way.
- **Resolving inconsistencies** – Sometimes participants will respond inconsistently to related items, such as answering that the last time they used alcohol was 4-12 months ago (S2a), but then later saying that they used alcohol 30 of the past 90 days (S2a1). Inconsistencies such as these should be questioned in a nonconfrontational way. In addition, apparent inattentiveness or misunderstandings should be checked out with the participant and clarified if needed.

Engagement – the quality of the interaction between the interviewer and the participant.

- **Flow of the interview** – This feature has to do with pacing. Is the interaction choppy or paced too fast for the participant? Or does it flow smoothly at an appropriate pace?
- **Appropriate voice articulation and inflection** – Pronunciation of words should be clear and appropriately paced. In addition, inflection of words and phrases is necessary as it adds meaning and helps with understanding, possibly positively influencing validity. Monotonic delivery is not appropriate.
- **Use of encouraging or motivational statements** – The GAIN-I is a long assessment. It’s not unusual for participants to show behavioral signs of fatigue (yawning, fidgeting, sighing, decreased voice tone, etc.) It helps when the interviewer offers encouragement or checks in with the participant.
- **Sensitivity to participant needs** – This is related to the above. How well does the interviewer appear to “read” and respond to the participant’s needs? Interviewers should periodically check in with the participant. Participants may need breaks for the bathroom,

for snacks, to shoot a few hoops, etc. These should be offered when they are clearly called for. (In addition, if the interviewer becomes fatigued, a break may be needed.)

- **Report** – How comfortably do the interviewer and participant appear to interact with each other?

4.4 How do you rate the quality of the four major A-QA sections of the GAIN?

At the end of each of the four main sections of the feedback form, a four-point rating scale (excellent, sufficient, minor problems, problems) is defined to help assign a summary rating of the quality of the administration in that section. The rating categories are qualitative in nature, so assigning a rating ultimately boils down to the informed judgment of the A-QA reviewer. Use the definitions of the rating categories in exhibit 4-1 to help assign summary ratings.

In general, problems are training issues, such as when an interviewer doesn't know how to correctly complete the S9 grid (Detailed Substance Use Disorder Worksheet) on the GAIN-I. Minor problems are small technical errors that are easily cleared up with an interviewer, such as when an interviewer skips or changes a few words or does not explain the response choices to the participant. Sufficient means the delivery is accurate and clear, nothing is technically in error, and validity is not harmed. Excellent means going above and beyond, such as when an interviewer personalizes the delivery of items based on information she has learned about the participant, uses the personal anchors often to define the time frames, or provides documentation for the researchers or therapists to help them understand the participant's answers or anything unusual about the assessment session.

What does it take to be certified in GAIN administration? In order to be certified, an interviewer should attain a rating of sufficient or better in all four rated sections of the feedback form. This *usually* happens within four submissions to the GCC.

Exhibit 4-1. Rating Scales for Quality Assurance Reviews

Documentation

Summary rating

Excellent: Use of legible selective notes to facilitate later review by clinicians or researchers

Sufficient: Everything is completed accurately and clearly

Minor problems: Some missing or incorrect items or minor problems in documentation

Problems: Major sections not done or not done correctly

Instructions

Summary rating

Excellent: Interviewer's instructions are individualized and used to better engage the participant, particularly on anchoring events in time

Sufficient: Everything is completed and instructions are not incorrect

Minor problems: Some missing or incorrect items or minor problems in instructions

Problems: Major sections not done or not done correctly

Items

Summary rating

Excellent: Interviewer appropriately repeats items and time frames, defines terms, or does

other things to increase the validity of the responses

Sufficient: Absence of problems impacting validity

Minor problems: Some changes in meaning, missing words, or changes in time frames

Problems: Repeated difficulties that introduce missing data or problems with validity

Engagement

Summary rating

Excellent: Interviewer engages participant and manages well, thereby increasing validity and making it less burdensome on the participant

Sufficient: Nonproblematic, acceptable rapport; good reading ability

Minor problems: Ignoring inattentiveness, misunderstandings, or inconsistencies; not offering encouragement where needed; reads too fast or too slow

Problems: Arguing with participant, ignoring participant's questions or emotional state

How do you balance an overall great performance against a very few minor errors?

Sometimes an interviewer will do a fantastic job with an assessment, but technically there will be a few minor errors (e.g., skipped a few administration ratings, changed a few words on the items that didn't seriously affect meaning, forgot to define response choices once, etc.). It seems senseless to have the interviewer and A-QA reviewer go through another round of A-QA just for a few things that may be easily remedied. If this happens, point out the few minor errors to the interviewer and provide additional clarification. As the A-QA reviewer, you may wish to check only those items on the next assessment hard copy, or review the next audio-recorded submission (or conduct another observation) listening mainly for those aspects that need to be remedied.

What's the bottom line? Given the qualitative nature of the ratings, it helps to have a bottom line. A helpful guideline is this: *Do you believe that the quality of the interviewer's administration maintains or adds to the validity of the data?*

4.5 How do you prepare A-QA feedback?

Regardless of the form of feedback (oral or written), the A-QA criteria and feedback form should be used to guide and document interviewers' feedback. If feedback is written, a Microsoft Word version of the feedback form is available. This allows the A-QA reviewer to type in feedback under each section.

Steps for completing the feedback form

- 1) Complete the Identifiers section at the top of the form. Even if feedback is oral, this should be completed in writing because it documents the feedback session.
- 2) Complete the four main sections. To guide oral feedback, the A-QA reviewer should write brief notes under the appropriate sections of the feedback form. These notes can be completed during the observed assessment or during an audio review.
- 3) Add any additional comments in the “Other” section. This is a good place for feedback that doesn’t seem to fit anywhere else, for overall comments, or for a brief summary of things needing improvement in order to reach certification.
- 4) Provide an overall rating on certification status.

Guidelines for preparing feedback

- **Feedback details aspects of the interview done well and aspects that need improvement.** It’s important to give a balanced assessment of the interview, reinforcing those things that are done well and offering examples and options for those things that need work.
- **Feedback should be specific and behavioral.** Describe what happened (or needs to happen next time) in behavioral terms, including quoting actual dialogue. If improvement is needed, provide examples of how the situation could be handled. If the interviewer did a good job with something, describe how or why it was good. Just saying “great job” or “needs work” throughout the feedback does not provide the interviewer with useful information.

Sample completed feedback forms. Three sample completed feedback forms are provided to illustrate the kind of feedback given for a variety of skill levels.

- The first example (Amy Zing) is from an assessment whose interviewer needs more training (attachment 4-3).
- The second example (Cookie Doe) is from an assessment with a number of specific, easily remedied technical problems (attachment 4-4).
- The third example (Val Idity) is from an assessment that earned the interviewer his GAIN Administrator certification (attachment 4-5).

4.6 What are some common A-QA problems on the GAIN?

The most common errors in GAIN administration are listed in exhibit 4-2.

Exhibit 4-2. Common Errors in GAIN Administration and Documentation

- 1) Documentation
 - a) Not completing the edit staff ID or edit date
 - b) UR and DM ratings rated NO or NONE even though the participant reports problems or misunderstands items
 - c) Miscodes—e.g., the participant answers “3” but the interviewer circles “2”
 - d) Not documenting errors or changes in responses
- 2) Instructions

- a) Parts of the introduction, general directions, or additional instructions for oral/self-administration are omitted
 - b) Using a negative event to anchor time frames
 - c) Paraphrasing of directions that is awkward or incomplete
 - d) Response choices are not defined for the participant
- 3) Items
- a) A skip is not followed
 - b) Words in items are changed, omitted, or added such that the meaning of the item is changed
 - c) Stems and time frames are not periodically repeated for longer items
 - d) Unnecessary parenthetical phrases are read
 - e) Failure of the interviewer to clarify ambiguous responses
 - f) Leading or offering responses to the participant
 - g) Not pointing out obvious or temporal inconsistencies
- 4) Engagement
- a) Pacing the interview too fast (and talking too fast)
 - b) Failing to offer breaks or encouragement when they are clearly needed
-

Frequently Asked Questions. Important supplementary information on many GAIN items is located in the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) appendix in the GAIN manual. This document lists questions and answers about GAIN administration that have come up over time. The document is updated periodically and is also available at <http://www.chestnut.org/LI/gain/index.html#Administration%20Manual>.

4.8 Practice Session

As part of quality assurance training, we suggest listening to an audio-recorded example of a GAIN-I administration (either a full assessment or just a few sections), stopping every few pages to share comments on both things done well and things needing additional work. As part of Chestnut training, your site will be given a sample case to use. Or you could use a recording that your site makes for training purposes. For confidentiality reasons the audio recording and assessment you receive in training is not a real interchange, but a scripted one. However, it was written based on actual GAIN administrations. When listening to the taped example, consider the following questions:

1. What does the interviewer do well?
2. What does the interviewer need to work on?
3. Using the A-QA criteria as a guideline, what feedback would you give the interviewer? (Remember to keep it balanced.)
4. How would you rate the four main sections of the feedback form for this interviewer?
5. Should this interviewer be given certification based on this interview?

4.9 Attachments Referenced in the A-QA Chapter

- Attachment 4-1 GAIN Administration Quality Assurance Feedback Form
- Attachment 4-2 Introducing the GAIN-I to Adolescents – Oral Administration
- Attachment 4-3 GAIN Administration Quality Assurance Feedback – Justin Case
- Attachment 4-4 GAIN Administration Quality Assurance Feedback – Cookie Doe
- Attachment 4-5 GAIN Administration Quality Assurance Feedback – Joe Oak
- Attachment 4-6 Top Ten Inconsistencies on the GAIN-I
- Attachment 4-7 GAIN Administration Quality Assurance Feedback Form Training Guide
- Attachment 4-8 GAIN submission form

**Attachment 4-1
GAIN Administration Quality Assurance
Feedback Form**

Identifiers			
Site ID (XSITE):		Reviewer site:	
Staff name:		Reviewer name:	
Staff ID (XSID):		Reviewer ID:	
Date of assessment (XOBSDT):		Date of review:	
Participant ID (XPID):		Assessment:	

Documentation

- Cover page and staff use box on page 2 –
- Documentation and scoring of Check for Cognitive Impairment –
- Documentation of anchors, literacy questions, and initial administration decision –
- Time to complete –
- Urgency and Denial-Misrepresentation ratings –
- Administration ratings –
- Documentation of participant responses –

Summary rating:

Instructions

- Introduction (purpose, format, length, privacy, confidentiality) –
- Administration of Check for Cognitive Impairment –
- Establishing time frames and anchors (main time frames and S2x) –
- Additional instructions for oral administration –
- Reading scales and transitional statements –
- Using the cards and defining response choices –
- Responding to participant questions about instructions –

Summary rating:

Items

- Accurate following of item order and skips –
- Accurate grid administration –
- Accurate following of word order –
- Appropriate use of stems and anchors –
- Appropriate use of parenthetical statements –
- Clarification of participant responses for coding –
- Responding to participant questions about items –
- Resolving inconsistencies –

Summary rating:

Engagement

- Flow of the interview –
- Appropriate voice articulation and inflection –
- Use of encouraging or motivational statements –
- Sensitivity to participant needs –
- Rapport –

Summary rating:

Other

Certification status:

Pending: Any below sufficient

Certified: All sufficient or above on same interview

Attachment 4-2
Introducing the GAIN-I to Adolescents – Oral Administration

I) Introduction

1) Purpose – Why are we doing the questionnaire?

“I’ll be spending the next couple hours with you to complete the first part of your treatment or counseling. The first part of treatment and counseling is the data-gathering phase. This is the part where we interview you to collect information about you, your family, your substance use, and any problems you may be having. This information will be used to help plan your treatment or counseling and also to evaluate our program.”

2) Content – What is the questionnaire about?

“The questionnaire we’re going to work on is called the GAIN-I. It is designed to help us track how you are doing before, during, and after treatment or counseling. It has questions about you and your experiences, what services you may be using, and what you currently want to get from treatment or counseling. You will be able to say that you don’t know or refuse to answer any question that you don’t want to answer.”

3) Time – How long will it take to complete? Breaks – Can I take a break if needed?

“Depending on how much has been going on in your life, it will take about 1 to 2 hours to complete. If you need a break at any time, just let me know.”

4) Confidentiality

“Before we start, there are a few important things I want to tell you. First, everything you tell me today is confidential. Do you know what ‘confidential’ means? (It means it’s private.) All treatment and counseling staff members who will work with you and have access to your information understand that it is confidential and have agreed to not share your information. For instance, people like your mom, your dad, your teachers, and your probation officer will *not* be told your answers without your prior written permission. The confidentiality of your answers are protected by law. However, there are two exceptions: we are required by law to report any instances of child abuse or situations in which you are presently a danger to yourself or others. Also, officials from the federal government have the right to audit our program to check that we have protected the confidentiality of your answers.”

II) Check for Cognitive Impairment

“I’ll be asking you lots of questions about when and how often things have happened to you. So before I do that, I need to get a sense of how well your memory is working right now.” [Go through items word-for-word and document score].

III) Anchors

1) Timeline

“Third, some of the questions ask about things that have happened during the past year or the past 90 days. To help you remember these time periods, please look at the calendar” [give calendar to participant].

a) Today’s date

“First, find today’s date and circle it.”

b) Anchor 90 days ago

“Next, count back 13 weeks to about 90 days ago and circle that date. Can you remember anything that was going on then? (Try to identify a positive personal anchor and write it on the instrument and calendar.) When we talk about things that happened to you during the past 90 days, we are talking about things since [anchor].”

c) Anchor one year ago

“Now, go back to a year ago and circle that date. Can you remember anything that was going on then? (Try to identify a positive personal anchor and write it on the instrument and calendar.) When I ask about things that have happened to you during **the past year**, I mean since [anchor]. Please keep this calendar handy to refer to as we go through the questionnaire to help you remember when different things happened.”

2) Literacy and initial administration questions

[These items are read as on the assessment.]

3) Additional instructions for oral administration

a) How we will proceed and record answers

“Here’s how we will proceed: I will read the items to you and record your answers right here on the questionnaire, by either circling an answer or filling in a box.”

b) Try to answer all, even if you have to guess.

“I am going to encourage you to answer all the items, and sometimes if you’re not sure of the answer, I’ll encourage you to take your best guess.”

c) It’s okay to say “I don’t know.”

“But if you really don’t know an answer, it’s okay to say ‘I don’t know.’”

d) You are free to refuse.

“And if there are some questions you don’t want to answer, you are free to refuse, although I will encourage you to try to answer all of them.”

e) Using the cards

“To answer some of the questions, you will need to consult a card. For instance, on this questionnaire we’re going to do, there are three cards (get sheet with cards): card A, card B, and card C. When we get to items that will need a card, I will let you know.”

f) Give the adolescent an opportunity to ask any questions.

“Before we start, do you have any questions?”

Attachment 4-3
GAIN Administration Quality Assurance
Feedback Form – Amy Zing (requires additional training)

Identifiers			
Site ID (XSITE):	123123	Reviewer site:	500
Staff name:	Amy Zing	Reviewer name:	A-QA Team
Staff ID (XSID):	4541415	Reviewer ID:	1234
Date of assessment (XOBSDT):	9/15/2008	Date of review:	10/1/2008
Participant ID (XPID):	559933	Assessment:	GAIN-I Full 5.6.0

Documentation

- Cover page and staff use box on page 2 –
 - The required fields were documented correctly. Great job!
 - The participant’s last name was left on the cover of the assessment. The interviewer should remove all personal information (e.g., last names, driver’s license number, etc.) from the assessment before submitting it for QA review.
- Documentation and scoring of Check for Cognitive Impairment –
 - The Check for Cognitive Impairment on page 3 was correctly scored and documented, **with one exception:**
 - The interviewer did not code an error score for A1a on page 2, but should have coded a score of “0” for no error.
 - For item A2f on page 3, the interviewer coded both “2” and “4,” but should have only coded “4” for this item.
- Documentation of anchors, literacy questions, and initial administration decision –
 - The 90-day and 12-month anchors were documented correctly. Good!
 - The literacy and initial administration questions on page 5 were documented correctly.
- Time to complete –
 - The time to complete could not be determined because the interviewer did not note the start and stop times of all of the breaks. The start and stop times of all breaks (noted in the margin where the break takes place) must be documented.
 - The start time (A1a on page 2) was documented correctly. Good!
 - The end time (Z1-Z1d on page 105) was not documented correctly. This page should be completed for the first day of the interview. The end time for the first day (Z1), total breaks from the first day (Z1c) and the total time to complete (Z1d) for the first day of administration should be recorded on page 105.
- Urgency and Denial-Misrepresentation ratings –
 - All of the Ratings appear to be correctly documented, **with the following exceptions:**
 - The Urgency ratings for the Background and Treatment Arrangements (page 12), Substance Use (page 40), and Environmental and Living Situation (page 84) sections were documented as “NOW.” However, since the participant did report needing help with some issues, but did not seem to have any emergency situations, a rating of “0-3 MON” would have been more appropriate for these sections. A code of NOW indicates a life-threatening, emergency situation, such as coughing up blood, suicidal with plan, or another situation that would require immediate assistance.

- The Denial-Misrepresentation ratings for the Background and Treatment Arrangements (page 12) and Mental and Emotional Health (page 69) sections were documented as “MISUNDER.” However, since the participant did do some guessing and estimating in these sections, but did not show pervasive misunderstanding of items in these sections, a rating of “SOME” would have been more appropriate. A rating of “MISUNDER” applies when the participant consistently has trouble understanding items even after additional clarification is given.
- The Denial-Misrepresentation rating for the Substance Use (page 40) and Physical Health (page 50) sections was documented as “NONE,” but a rating of “SOME” would be more appropriate since the participant did some guessing and estimating in these sections.
- The Urgency rating for the Risk Behaviors and Disease Prevention section (page 58) was documented as “ALREADY,” but a rating of “0-3 MON” would have been more appropriate since the participant did not report receiving help in this area of his life.
- The Urgency rating for the Mental and Emotional Health section (page 69) was documented as “NOW,” but a rating of “ALREADY” would have been more appropriate since the participant reported that he was on medication and seeing a health professional for his mental health issues.
- Administration ratings –
 - The Administration Ratings were correctly completed, **with the following exceptions:**
 - Item XADMa2a on page 106 (What was the mode of administration? Done with Pen and paper) was documented as “No,” but should have been “Yes.”
 - Item XADMj on page 108 was not completed, but should have been. If the interviewer does not have any additional comments, “No” or “None” can be documented for this item.
- Documentation of participant responses –
 - The interviewer did a good job of legibly documenting the participant’s responses throughout the assessment.
 - Throughout the assessment, the interviewer did a very nice job of remembering to code all of the responses (both “Yes” and “No”) on MENTIONED items.
 - The interviewer did a great job documenting “3A/Marijuana” for items S1a and S1b on page 13. Great!
 - The interviewer did a great job documenting the participant’s verbatim responses throughout the interview. Nice!
 - **Some items were not documented or not correctly documented.**
 - For item S4 on page 22 (Before today, have you ever had a breathalyzer or urine test...), the participant said, “Yes” but the interviewer documented, “No.”
 - For items S9h and S9k on page 38, the participant responded, “1+ years ago” but the interviewer coded “2-12 months ago.”
 - For item M5a on page 67, the interviewer coded, “0/Any condition reported” and “2/Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder” but should not have since the participant did not report any condition for this item.
 - For item E1 on page 70, the interviewer documented “1/A house, apartment or room you, your spouse...rent or own” and “4/A friend or relative’s house, apartment or room”, but should have only coded “4/A friend or relative’s house, apartment or

- room” since the participant reported living at his cousin’s house. Additionally, only one response should be coded for this item.
- For items E3a2-99 on page 72, the interviewer coded, “8/Other relatives,” “10/Other children over the age of 12” and “99/Other” and recorded the participant’s verbatim response but should have only coded “8/Other relatives” and “10/Other children over the age of 12”.
 - Item E3b2 on page 72 (What is your current marital status?) was not coded, but should have been coded as “8/Never married and not living as married” on the interviewer’s own.
 - The changes to items E5 on page 76 and E12a10 on page 81 were not documented correctly. The interviewer should cross out the original response, document the new response (in the margin if necessary), and initial and date the change the date it was made.
 - For item L5a on page 88, the participant said that he had been arrested for “Theft and running away” and the interviewer coded “99/Status or other offenses” and documented “theft and running away” on the verbatim line. However, the interviewer should have coded “5/Larceny or theft” for theft and documented “Running away” on the verbatim line for L5a99.

Summary rating: Problems

Instructions

- Introduction (purpose, format, length, privacy, confidentiality) –
 - All parts of the Introduction on page 2 were covered.
 - **Note:** The interviewer does not need to read the bolded items (e.g. Purpose, Format) in the introduction on page 2.
- Administration of Check for Cognitive Impairment –
 - The Check for Cognitive Impairment on page 3 was properly administered. Great!
- Establishing time frames and anchors (main time frames and S2x) –
 - The interviewer did a great job of probing for the participant’s 90-day and 12-month anchors, **with the following exceptions:**
 - For the 90-day anchor, the anchor date was May 7, 2008 and the anchor event that was used was, “My big brother’s birthday.” However, the participant said that his brother’s birthday was on May 12th. For the 90-day anchor, the interviewer should make sure that the anchor event occurs within two days of the anchor date. It would have been appropriate to suggest “5 days before my big brothers birthday” be used for the anchor.
 - The interviewer did not read the statements, “When we talk about things happening to you during “the past 90 days/past 12 month,” we are talking about things that happened since about...” to the participant. These statements should be read to the participant after determining each anchor event.
 - For the 12-month anchor, the participant said that he had gone “rafting with his uncle sometime around then.” The interviewer should have probed to determine when the participant went on the rafting trip to determine whether the event would be

appropriate to use for the 12-month anchor. **Note:** The 12-month anchor event should occur within 7 days of the anchor date.

- Additional instructions for oral administration –
 - The Additional Instructions for Oral Administration on page 5 were read to the participant.
- Reading scales and transitional statements –
 - Scales and transitional statements were introduced for the participant, **with the following exceptions:**
 - The transitional statement above item M1j on page 61 (The next questions are about whether and how these problems have interacted with your drug and alcohol use) was not read to the participant but should have been.
 - The scale before item M3a on page 63 (Please answer the next questions using yes or no) was not read to the participant but should have been.
- Using the cards and defining response choices –
 - The interviewer did a good job of using the cards and defining the response choices throughout the interview, **with one exception:**
 - For item E7 on page 77, the interviewer did not limit the response choices, but should have since the participant reported regularly socializing with 1 person. **Note:** For items E5-E7 on pages 76-77, if the participant reports 1 person, the response choices should be limited to “None” and “All”; for 2 people, it should be “None,” “Some,” and “All”; for 3 or more people reported, all response choices should be left available.
- Responding to participant questions about instructions –
 - For item L3 on page 85 (When was the last time you did anything you thought might get you in trouble or be against the law besides using alcohol or other drugs?) the participant asked, “Are you going to tell my probation officer?” The interviewer said, “No, everything is 100% confidential.” However, the interviewer should have reminded the participant of the exceptions to confidentiality as explained in the Introduction.

Summary rating: Minor Problems

Items

- Accurate following of item order and skips –
 - The interviewer did a good job following the skip instructions [IF MALE, CIRCLE 0 IN P10u1 AND GO TO P11] at the top of page 47. Nice!
 - The interviewer did a great job following the skip instructions before item L2 on page 85 (Circle 0 if never married and no children).
 - The interviewer did a good job following the skip instructions at the top of page 96 [IF UNDER 17, CIRCLE 0 AND GO TO V5].
 - **Some skips were not followed; therefore, unnecessary items were administered.**
 - The skip instruction following item S3a on page 21 [IF NO PAST WEEK USE, CODE NO] was not followed; therefore, item S3b on page 21 was administered unnecessarily.
 - The skip instructions following item S9b1 on page 35 [GO TO S9c] were not followed; therefore, item S9b2 on page 35 was administered unnecessarily.

- Items P11f, P11g, and P11h on page 48 were administered but should not have been since the participant reported no lifetime service use in items P11a-c.
- Items M5f and M5g on page 68 were administered but should not have been since the participant reported no lifetime service use in items M5b and M5c.
- The skip instructions above item L7a on page 92 [Record 0 if no prior arrests] were not followed; therefore, item L7a on page 92 was administered but should not have been.
- **Some items were not administered but should have been.**
 - Item A4c on page 7 (What is this person’s relationship to you?) was not administered but should have been.
 - Item B5a on page 10 (What is the name of your insurance company or provider?) was not administered but should have been.
 - Item B5b on page 10 (Is your insurance publicly funded, privately funded, or mixed?) was not administered but should have been.
- Accurate grid administration –
 - The interviewer did a good job of administering the S2 grid on pages 15-17.
 - The S9 grid on p. 38 was administered correctly, **with the following exception:**
 - The interviewer asked, “Can you tell me when marijuana...” for each item, instead of asking, “Can you tell me which substance...?” The interviewer should ask each item as an open-ended question, and allow the participant to name which substances caused which problems.
 - The interviewer administered the Pre-Controlled-Environment Use grid on page 20 but should not have since the participant reported 10 days for item S2x on page 19. **Note:** skip instructions for this item read: **[IF 0-12, GO TO S3a]**. Therefore, the grid should only be administered if the participant reports 13 or more days in a controlled environment for item S2x.
- Accurate following of word order –
 - The interviewer did a good job of following the word order throughout the assessment, **with the following exceptions:**
 - For item S2c2 on page 16, the interviewer asked, “What was the most you had in one day” but should have asked, “What was the most joints you had in one day?”
 - For item S9r on page 38, the interviewer said, “you were able to cut down on...” but should have said, “you were unable to cut down on...”
 - For item P3d on page 41, the interviewer said, “lost or gained 10 or more pounds when you were trying not to,” but should have said, “lost or gained 10 or more pounds when you were not trying to.”
 - For the instructions at the top of page 51, the interviewer said, “Do not include shots given by a doctor or nurse. Do not include if you were injected by...” but should have said, “Do not include shots given by a doctor or nurse, but do include if you were injected by...”
- Appropriate use of stems and anchors –
 - The interviewer rarely referred to the participant’s personal anchors throughout the assessment.

- Both anchors should be used early in the interview, throughout the early sections of the interview, and then periodically during the rest of it or whenever the interviewer feels that the participant needs reminding of the time frames.
- The interviewer did a nice job of repeating the stems on long lists of items.
- Appropriate use of parenthetical statements –
 - Parenthetical material was used appropriately throughout the assessment. Great job!
- Clarification of participant responses for coding –
 - **Some of the participant’s responses were clarified very efficiently.**
 - For item B2b on page 8, the participant said that his grandparents had legal custody of him and the interviewer clarified by asking, “Do they have legal custody or are you just staying with them?” Great job!
 - For item S1b on page 13, the participant said that he most needed treatment for “Drugs” and the interviewer asked, “Which ones?” Great!
 - For item S6b on page 24 (Have you ever stayed overnight in a recovery home or sanctuary?), the participant asked if jail would count and the interviewer clarified that jail would not be included for this item. Nice work!
 - For item P10 on page 45, the participant said that he did not need any medical attention to attend treatment and the interviewer asked if he needed treatment for his knee disorder.
 - For item P10s on page 46 (any other major medical problems or conditions other than those just mentioned?), the participant asked if “Bipolar” would count and the interviewer said, “No, this is more for your health in general.”
 - For item R1 on page 51(When was the last time, if ever, that you used a needle to inject...), the participant asked if he should include a shot given by a doctor and the interviewer said, “Do not include shots given by a doctor or nurse.” Great!
 - For item V5 on page 96 (...how many times have you applied for a job?), the participant said, “5 or 6” and the interviewer asked, “How many times do you want me to put?” Nice!
 - **Some responses could have been clarified more efficiently.**
 - The interviewer did a very nice job of asking “Any others?” or “Anyone else?” after items that required it, such as MENTIONED items, verbatim items, E12b on page 81 (What do you consider to be your most important strengths as a person?) and E12d on page 81 (Which people, agencies, or things do you consider to be your most important sources of social support?), etc. Good work!
 - For some numerical responses, the participant said, “probably”, “like”, or “about”. The interviewer should make sure to clarify these responses by asking, “What number would you like me to put?” to ensure that the most accurate information is being collected.
 - For item A4a on page 7, the participant said that he was coming to treatment for “Depression, drugs and alcohol, and getting my life together.” However, the interviewer should have clarified that this question is asking for the participant’s **main** reason for coming to treatment, and that only one response should be recorded.
 - For item A4a on page 7, the interviewer coded the participant’s main reason for coming to treatment as “7/Pressure from criminal justice system.” However, the participant had said that he was coming to treatment for “Depression, drugs and

- alcohol, and getting my life together.” The interviewer should have clarified this item and coded a more appropriate response (e.g., “3/General personal motive”, “4/Health reasons”, etc).
- For item S2j on page 15 (painkillers, opiates, or other analgesics), the participant said, “No” and the interviewer asked, “Never?” but should have clarified by saying something like, “So using Card A, what would that be?”
 - For item S2c5 on page 17, the participant said that he had used marijuana “Almost 2 months ago” and the interviewer said, “So around June 6th?” but should have let the participant determine the date.
 - For item S7 on page 26 (How many times in your life have you been admitted to treatment...), the participant said, “I haven’t. Never” and the interviewer recorded, “00.” The interviewer should have clarified by asking for a number of days.
 - For item P11d on page 47, the participant said that he was taking “Concerta”. The interviewer should have clarified that this question was asking if the participant was taking medication for physical health problems and that he should not include medication taken for mental health for this item.
 - For item R4 on page 56 (When was the last time you smoked or used any kind of tobacco?), the participant said, “A year ago” and the interviewer said, “Okay, so 4-12 months ago?” However, the interviewer should have clarified by saying something like, “Using Card A, what would that be?”
 - For item M1a1 on page 59 (headaches, faintness, dizziness, tingling, numbness, sweating, or hot or cold spells?), the participant asked what ‘significant’ meant and the interviewer said, “When you have it for two weeks,” but should have read the entire definition to the participant.
 - For item M5a on page 67 (Has a doctor, nurse, or counselor ever told you that you have a mental, emotional, or psychological problem...), the participant said, “I think so, I take medicine to help me settle down” and the interviewer coded “2/Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder.” The interviewer should have clarified by asking if the participant had ever been told that he had a certain problem or condition and coded the condition accordingly.
 - For item V7 on page 99, the participant said, “I don’t work” and the interviewer coded “6/Unemployed or laid off and not looking for work.” The interviewer should have clarified by asking the participant if he was still in school, on summer break, or in some other situation.
- Responding to participant questions about items –
 - There were no questions about items during the interview.
 - Resolving inconsistencies –
 - **Some inconsistencies or misunderstandings were caught and clarified efficiently.**
 - There was an inconsistency between items E9d on page 78 and E9t on page 79. On page 78, the participant said that he had been abused emotionally, but on page 79 said that he had never been attacked with a weapon, beaten, sexually abused, or emotionally abused. The interviewer pointed out that this item would include emotional abuse and the participant gave a more consistent response of “3-7 days ago” for item E9t. Great catch!
 - **Some inconsistencies or misunderstandings were not caught and clarified.**

- There was an inconsistency between items S2c5 on page 16 and S2s4 on page 18. On page 16, the participant said that he last used marijuana on “June 6th, 2008” but on page 18 said that he had not used any alcohol or other drugs for 76 days in a row in the past 90 days, which was approximately 60 days prior to the interview. The interviewer should have pointed out this inconsistency and re-administered the necessary items.
- There was an inconsistency between items S9k on page 38 and S9k on page 39. On page 38, the participant said that his substance use had caused him to have repeated problems with the law “2-12 months ago,” but on page 39 said that that had happened “1+ years ago” for both “marijuana and huffing”. The interviewer should have pointed out this inconsistency and re-administered the necessary items.
 - This also happened for items S9n, S9q, S9s, and S9u on page 39.
- There was an inconsistency between items P11e and P11j1 on page 48. In item P11e, the participant said that he had taken prescribed medication “1-3 months ago”, but in item P11j1 said that he had taken medication for a health problem for 80 of the past 90 days. The interviewer should have pointed out this inconsistency and re-administered the necessary items.
- There was an inconsistency between item M1e on page 61 and the participant’s responses to items on pages 59 and 60. The participant reported having several significant issues within the past 12 months on pages 59 and 60, but on page 61 said that he had last been significantly disturbed by nerve, mental, or psychological problems “More than 12 months ago.” The interviewer should have pointed out this inconsistency and re-administered the necessary items.
- There was an inconsistency between items M5d and M5e on page 68. In item M5d, the participant said that he was currently taking medication for mental, emotional, behavioral, or psychological problems, but in item M5e said that the last time he had taken medication for one of these problems was “1-3 months ago”. The interviewer
- There was an inconsistency between items V5a on page 96 and V6 on page 98. On page 96, the participant said that he had no job experience, but said on page 98 that he had worked at a civilian job or was self-employed “1-3 months ago”. The interviewer should have pointed out this inconsistency and re-administered the necessary items.

Summary rating: Problems

Engagement

- Flow of the interview –
 - The pace of the interview was appropriate for this participant.
- Appropriate voice articulation and inflection –
 - The interviewer used good voice articulation and inflection. Great!
- Use of encouraging or motivational statements –
 - The interviewer didn’t make any explicitly encouraging statements, but rapport was good and the participant seemed motivated to continue the interview without them.

- Motivational statements like, “You’re doing a great job,” “We just finished that section,” etc. are important to keep the participant involved in the interview and motivated to continue.
- Sensitivity to participant needs –
 - The interviewer did a nice job of offering breaks to the participant. Good!
- Rapport –
 - The interviewer seemed friendly and approachable.

Summary rating: Minor Problems

Other

Certification status: Pending

Pending: Any below sufficient

Certified: All sufficient or above on same interview

Attachment 4-4
GAIN Administration Quality Assurance
Feedback Form – Cookie Doe (moderate, easily corrected issues)

Identifiers			
Site ID (XSITE):	999999	Reviewer site:	500
Staff name:	Cookie Doe	Reviewer name:	A-QA Team
Staff ID (XSID):	191919	Reviewer ID:	1727
Date of assessment (XOBSDT):	11/08/2004	Date of review:	11/20/2004
Participant ID (XPID):	292929	Assessment:	GAIN-I Full 5.6

Documentation

- Cover page and staff use box on page 2 –
 - All of the required fields were correctly documented.
- Documentation and scoring of Check for Cognitive Impairment –
 - Legible, correctly documented, and correctly scored – great job!
- Documentation of anchors, literacy questions, and initial administration decision –
 - The anchors for the past 90 days and past 12 months were documented accurately.
 - The literacy questions and initial administration decision were documented correctly.
- Time to complete –
 - The time to complete was documented correctly.
 - There was one break taken during the assessment, which was correctly documented with the start and end times. Good work!
- Urgency and Denial-Misrepresentation ratings –
 - The Urgency and Denial-Misrepresentation ratings appear to be correctly documented, **with the following exception:**
 - For the Mental Health section, the interviewer coded an Urgency Rating of GT 3 MON on page 69. However, the participant did not report any problems or any history of mental problems, so a code of NO would be more appropriate. *Please go back and change the code on the hard copy and in the database.*
- Administration ratings –
 - The administration ratings were correctly completed.
- Documentation of participant responses –
 - The interviewer did a nice job of legibly documenting all the participant’s responses throughout the assessment.
 - The interviewer did a nice job of correctly documenting any change made to the GAIN by documenting her initials and the date that the change was made – good job!
 - The interviewer did a nice job of not including the participant’s last name on the cover page or the referrer’s last name for item A4b on page 7 (What is the name of the person who referred you to treatment?).
 - The interviewer did a great job of documenting the “no” responses for all Mentioned items. Nice work!
 - **A few items were not documented or not correctly documented.**

- The interviewer documented the participant’s verbatim response of “alcohol” for item S1b on page 13 (Between alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, heroin, and any other drugs, for which ones do you most need treatment?). However, the response was not coded using the detailed drug codes on page 13, but should have been coded as “1.” *Please go back and document a code of “1” for this item both on the hard copy and in the database.*
- The interviewer did not document the participant’s responses to items E12c7 and E12c8 on page 81. The interviewer should have documented “0/No” for both items. *Please go back and make the change on the hard copy and in the database.*

Summary rating: Minor problems

Instructions

- Introduction (purpose, format, length, privacy, confidentiality) –
 - All parts of the Introduction were covered.
- Administration of Check for Cognitive Impairment –
 - The Check for Cognitive Impairment was properly administered.
- Establishing time frames and anchors (main time frames and S2x) –
 - The interviewer did a good job of probing for the participant’s 90-day and 12-month anchors.
- Additional instructions for oral administration –
 - The interviewer read the additional instructions for oral administration to the participant. Great job!
- Reading scales and transitional statements –
 - Scales and transitional statements were read to the participant, **with the following exceptions:**
 - The scale (Please answer the next questions using the number of days) was not read before items B2c-d on page 8 but should have been.
 - The scale (Please answer the next questions using yes or no) was not read before items B9a1-7 on page 12 was not read to the participant but should have been.
- Using the cards and defining response choices –
 - The interviewer did a nice job of using the cards and defining the response choices for the participant, **with the following exception:**
 - For items E5a-g on page 76, the participant reported living with two people. Therefore the interviewer should have limited the response choices from Card C to “none,” “some,” and “all.”
- Responding to participant questions about instructions –
 - The participant did not ask any questions about instructions during the interview.

Summary rating: Sufficient

Items

- Accurate following of item order and skips –
 - The interviewer did a great job of following skips throughout the assessment.

- **Note:** It was not necessary for the interviewer to administer item P10n on page 46 (Female problems) because the participant was male. However, the interviewer did catch the mistake and apologized. Great catch!
- Accurate grid administration –
 - The interviewer correctly administered the S2 grid on pages 15-17.
 - The interviewer correctly administered the S9 grid on pages 38-39, **with the following exception:**
 - The interviewer administered item S9h on page 39, but should not have, since the participant responded “never” for item S9h on page 38.
- Accurate following of word order –
 - The interviewer did a nice job of following word order during the interview, **with the following exceptions:**
 - The interviewer omitted the words “to use” when reading item S1a on page 13 (Between alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, heroin, and any other drugs, which do you like to use the most?).
 - For item S9v in the S9 grid on page 39, the interviewer should have asked, “At what age did you first get drunk?” instead of “At what age did you first use alcohol?”
 - The interviewer read “high school” instead of “school” for item V1 on page 94 (What is the last grade or year that you completed in school?).
- Appropriate use of stems and anchors –
 - All stems and anchors were used appropriately throughout the assessment. Nice!
 - The interviewer occasionally incorporated the participant’s personal anchors but should have done so more often in order to remind the participant of the referenced time frame. Anchors should be used when switching between 90-day and 12-month time frames, after breaks, and at the beginning of new sections.
 - The interviewer did a good of repeating the stems on long lists of items (e.g., P10a-s on page 46 and M3a1-18 on page 63).
- Appropriate use of parenthetical statements –
 - Parenthetical material was used when necessary. Nice work!
- Clarification of participant responses for coding –
 - **Some items were clarified very efficiently.**
 - The interviewer appropriately asked, “Any others?” in order to clarify Mentioned and other open-ended items. Great job!
 - The interviewer did a nice job of probing for a response to item B2b on page 8 (Who currently has legal custody of you?). The participant initially responded, “my parents.” The interviewer asked whether his parents were living together or separated in order to clarify the response prior to coding.
 - When the participant responded, “5 or 6 beers” for item S2a2 on page 16 (What was the most drinks you had in one day?), the interviewer did a great job of clarifying by asking whether it was 5 or 6 beers, and then asking the participant the size of the beers.
 - For item P11j1 on page 48 (During the past 90 days, how many days did you take prescribed medication for a health problem?), the participant initially responded, “6 or 7.” The interviewer appropriately asked him, “Would you say 6, 7, or some other number?”

- For item V6m on page 98 (During the past 90 days on how many days did you work full time?) the participant said “no.” The interviewer reminded him to respond using a number of days, and then re-administered the item.
- **Some items could have been clarified more efficiently.**
 - For item B3a on page 9 (Which races, ethnicities, nationalities, or tribes best describe you?), the interviewer should have asked “Any others?” to ensure that all of the participant’s information had been collected.
 - For items E12b (What do you consider to be your most important strengths as a person?) and E12d (Which people, agencies, or things do you consider to be your most important sources of social support?) on page 81, the interviewer did not ask “any others?” to clarify the participant’s responses, but should have.
 - For item E1 on page 70 (What kind of housing do you currently live in?), the participant said, “with my parents.” The interviewer then asked, “With your parents in an apartment or house?” and participant responded, “In a house.” The interviewer should have also asked if the house was considered rent subsidized or public housing before coding a response.
 - For items V3p (During the past 90 days, on how many days did you get in trouble at school or training for any reason?) and V3q (During the past 90 days, on how many days were you suspended from school or training for any reason?) on page 95, the participant answered no, and the interviewer coded 0. However, the interviewer should have asked the participant to respond using a number of days before coding a response.
- Responding to participant questions about items –
 - The participant did not have any questions about items during the interview.
- Resolving inconsistencies –
 - **One inconsistency was not caught or clarified:**
 - For item M1e on page 61 (When was the last time your life was significantly disturbed by nerve, mental, or psychological problems or that you felt you could not go on, including those things we just talked about?) the participant said “Never.” However, he had answered yes to items M1b4, M1b6, and M1b7 on page 59, which count for M1e. The interviewer should have pointed out this inconsistency, explained that item M1e is specifically referring to the questions on the previous pages, and asked the item again.

Summary rating: Minor problems

Engagement

- Flow of the interview –
 - The pace of the interview was appropriate for this participant.
- Appropriate voice articulation and inflection –
 - The interviewer used good voice articulation and inflection.
- Use of encouraging or motivational statements –
 - The interviewer did not make any encouraging statements during the assessment, but should have. The interviewer should use statements such as “Thank you for your

patience” and “We’re about halfway done” in order to keep the participant motivated to continue.

- Sensitivity to participant needs –
 - The interviewer did not offer the participant any breaks during the interview, but should have.
- Rapport –
 - Rapport was good.

Summary rating: Minor problems

Other

Certification status: Pending

Attachment 4-5
GAIN Administration Quality Assurance
Feedback Form – Val Idity (certified)

Identifiers			
Site ID (XSITE):	999999	Reviewer site:	500
Staff name:	Val Idity	Reviewer name:	A-QA Team
Staff ID (XSID):	999999	Reviewer ID:	1727
Date of assessment (XOBSDT):	03/16/2005	Date of review:	03/28/2005
Participant ID (XPID):	999999	Assessment:	GAIN-I 5.6

Documentation

- Cover page and staff use box on page 2 –
 - All the required fields were correctly documented.
- Documentation and scoring of Check for Cognitive Impairment –
 - Legible and correctly documented and scored.
- Documentation of anchors, literacy questions, and initial administration decision –
 - The 90-day and 12-month anchors were accurately documented. Nice job!
 - The literacy questions and initial administration decision were documented correctly.
- Time to complete –
 - The time to complete (Z1d on page 105) was accurately calculated.
 - The start and stop times of breaks were documented on the assessment. Excellent!
- Urgency and Denial-Misrepresentation ratings –
 - All the ratings appear to be correctly documented.
- Administration ratings –
 - All administration ratings appear to be correctly documented.
- Documentation of participant responses –
 - The interviewer did a good job of legibly documenting the participant’s responses throughout the assessment.
 - The interviewer did a nice job of coding all responses on Mentioned items throughout the assessment.
 - **Some items were not documented or not correctly documented.**
 - For some changes made to the GAIN (e.g., B2b on page 8), the interviewer did not include their initials, but should have.
 - Item V1av1 on page 94 (“What kind of services or program did you go to?” verbatim) did not need to be administered, but the interviewer did a nice job of noting the mistake and documenting that the error was clarified and corrected. Good catch!

Summary rating: Sufficient

Instructions

- Introduction (purpose, format, length, privacy, confidentiality) –
 - The introduction was read in its entirety.

- Administration of Check for Cognitive Impairment –
 - The Check for Cognitive Impairment was properly administered.
- Establishing time frames and anchors (main time frames and S2x) –
 - The interviewer did a great job of probing for the 90-day and 12-month anchors.
- Additional instructions for oral administration –
 - The interviewer read the additional instructions for oral administration.
- Reading scales and transitional statements –
 - All scales and transitional statements were read to the participant.
- Using the cards and defining response choices –
 - The interviewer did a good job of using the cards and defining the response choices throughout the interview.
- Responding to participant questions about instructions –
 - There were no questions about instructions during the interview.

Summary rating: Sufficient

Items

- Accurate following of item order and skips –
 - The interviewer did an excellent job of following item order and skips throughout the interview.
- Accurate grid administration –
 - The interviewer correctly administered the S2 grid on pages 15-17. Great!
 - The interviewer did a nice job of administering the S9 grid on pages 38-39.
- Accurate following of word order –
 - The interviewer did a fine job of following word order throughout the assessment.
- Appropriate use of stems and anchors –
 - Throughout the assessment the interviewer did a nice job of referring to the participant's personal anchors.
 - The interviewer did a nice job of repeating the stems on long lists of items.
- Appropriate use of parenthetical statements –
 - Parenthetical material was used appropriately.
- Clarification of participant responses for coding –
 - **The interviewer did a good job of clarifying some of the participant's responses.**
 - For item S2r on page 15 (When was the last time, if ever, you used any other drug that has not been mentioned?), the participant responded with more than one substance. The interviewer did a great job of asking her which substance she used most recently in order to code the most accurate time frame.
 - For item S4a on page 22 (During the past 90 days, how many times have you been given a breathalyzer or urine test to check for your alcohol or other drug use?), the participant responded, "24 or 25 times." The interviewer asked, "Would you like me to put 24, 25, or something else?" before documenting a response. Great job!
 - The interviewer did a good job of clarifying the participant's vague response to item E1 on page 70 (What kind of housing do you currently live in?) by offering her some of the response choices.

- For item V3k on page 95 (During the past 90 days, how many days did you go to any kind of school or training?) the participant said “ Probably around 30 days.” The interviewer did a great job of asking, “would you like me to write 30 days or some other number?” before documenting a response. Great!
- The interviewer did a great job of explaining the meaning of item V11r on page 103 (During the past 90 days, about how much did you receive all together from each of the following sources?) by reading the transitional statement a second time.
- **Some items could have been clarified more efficiently.**
 - For item S7a99 on page 28 (How many of these times were you in any other kind of treatment program or working with some other kind of case manager for your alcohol or other drug use problems?), the participant said that she was attending AA. The interviewer initially wrote down this response but then crossed it out and wrote “0.” The interviewer should have explained that AA (and other self-help programs) would not be included, and then re-administered the item. The interviewer should not change a participant’s response without clarification.
 - After the participant gave one response to item E3a2-99 on page 72 (Who have you lived with?) it would have been a good idea for the interviewer to clarify whether the participant had lived with anyone else by asking, “Any others?”
 - It might have been a good idea for the interviewer to clarify that for item V7 on page 99 (Which of the following statements best describes your present work or school situation?) the participant should choose the situation she engaged in most often. Therefore, it probably would have been more appropriate to code 8 (In school or training) because the participant likely spends more time as school than at her part-time job.
- Responding to participant questions about items –
 - There were no questions about items during the interview.
- Resolving inconsistencies –
 - **The interviewer did a nice job of catching and clarifying inconsistencies.**
 - For item R2 on page 53 (When was the last time, if ever, that you had any kind of vaginal, oral, or anal sex with another person?), the participant responded that the last time was 1 to 3 months before the interview. However, for item R2p on page 54 (During the past 90 days, how many sex partners did you have who were male?) she answered “zero,” and for item R2r on the same page (During the past 90 days, how many times did you have any kind of vaginal, oral, or anal sex with another person?) she said she had not had any kind of sex during the past 90 days. The interviewer did a nice job of catching the inconsistencies between these responses and clarifying by explaining the inconsistencies, then re-administering the items.
 - The participant’s responses to items E8 on page 77 (When was the last time, if ever, that during an argument with someone else you swore, cursed, threatened them, threw something, or pushed or hit them in any way?) and E8p on page 78 (During the past 90 days, on how many days did you have an argument with someone else in which you swore, cursed, threatened them, threw something, or pushed or hit them in any way?) were inconsistent. For item E8, the participant responded, “1 to 3 months ago,” but for item E8p she said that she had not done any of those things during the past 90

days. The interviewer pointed out the inconsistency and then re-administered item E8p, and the participant changed her response.

Summary rating: Sufficient

Engagement

- Flow of the interview –
 - The pace of the interview was appropriate for this participant.
- Appropriate voice articulation and inflection –
 - The interviewer used good voice articulation and inflection.
- Use of encouraging or motivational statements –
 - The interviewer made several encouraging statements during the interview, such as “another section down,” “We’re getting close to the end,” “There are only two more sections left,” and “You’re doing a great job.” These statements are important to offer as to keep the participant motivated to continue – good job!
- Sensitivity to participant needs –
 - The interviewer did a nice job of offering breaks to the participant.
 - The interviewer also occasionally asked the participant, “how are you doing?” during the interview. Great!
- Rapport –
 - Rapport was excellent during the interview.. The interviewer was friendly and professional throughout the interview.

Summary rating: Sufficient

Other

Certification status: Certified

Attachment 4-6 The Top 10 GAIN Inconsistencies

Pages correspond to the full GAIN-I 5.6.0

1. The time frame for the last time a substance was used (reported on the first page of the S2 grid) does not match the date of last use (reported on the third page of the S2 grid).

Example: Say that today is 1/31/2006. For S2a on p. 15, the first page of the grid (When was the last time you used any kind of alcohol?), the participant answers, “1-4 weeks ago.” But then for S2_5a on p. 17, the third page of the grid (On what date did you last use any kind of alcohol?), his response is “1/30/2006.” The date reported for S2_5a doesn’t fit into the time frame reported for S2a. For these items to be consistent, the participant would have had to report either last using alcohol within the past two days (for S2a on the first page) or a date between 1/3/2006 and 1/24/2006 (for S2_5a on the third page).

2. Item S2s1a on p. 18 (During the past 90 days, on how many days did you go without using any alcohol, marijuana, or other drugs?) is not consistent with the days of use reported on p. 16 of the S2 grid.

Example: For item S2_1a on p. 16, the second page of the S2 grid (During the past 90 days, on how many days have you used any kind of alcohol?), the participant answers, “75 days.” Then for item S2s1a on p. 18 he reports going 30 days out of the past 90 without using anything. If the participant has used alcohol on 75 days out of the past 90, it’s impossible for him to have also gone 30 days without using alcohol in the same 90-day time period (75 days of use + 30 days of nonuse = 105). The total days of use and nonuse within a 90-day period need to equal 90.

Remember that multiple substances can be used on the same days, which may need to be clarified with the participant. For example, in the S2 grid the participant reports using alcohol on 60 days and marijuana on 60 days, and for S2s1a he reports going 30 days without using anything. If the interviewer clarifies and the participant says that he used both substances together every time he used them, then the items are consistent: 60 days of use + 30 days of nonuse = 90. But if the participant says that he used only alcohol on some days and only marijuana on others, the number of days of use is more than 60, which means that the responses are inconsistent and need to be clarified.

3. The time frame for the last use of a substance, reported on the first page of the S2 grid, is inconsistent with the time frame for the same substance as reported in the S9 grid on p. 39.

Example: For item S2c on p. 15 the participant reports that she last used marijuana 4-12 months ago. But then for an item in the S9 grid on p. 39, the participant says that the last time marijuana caused her to have a problem was within the past month. The time frame reported for substances in the S2 grid need to correspond with the time frames reported for those substances in the S9 grid.

4. Time frames between the same items on the two pages of the S9 grid (pp. 38-39) are inconsistent.

Example: For item S9j on the page before the grid (p. 38) the participant says that the last time he kept using alcohol or drugs where it made the situation unsafe was within the past month. Then for item S9j in the grid itself (p. 39) he reports having used alcohol or drugs where it made the situation unsafe 1+ years ago. The time frame on the page before the grid (p. 38) is more recent

than the time frame reported in the grid (p. 39), so the interviewer needs to explain the inconsistency to the participant and re-administer the items.

Another situation is if the time frames are reversed: on the first page (p. 38) the participant reports last using alcohol or drugs in an unsafe situation 1+ years ago, but then in the grid (p. 39) he reports using alcohol or drugs in an unsafe situation within the past month. These items, too, are inconsistent and need to be clarified.

Note: if in the grid the participant reports more than one substance for the same item, at least one of the time frames reported for those substances must match the general time frame reported on the page before the grid, and none of the time frames in the grid can be more recent than the time frame reported on the preceding page. For instance, on the page before the grid (p. 38) the participant reports having a problem 2-12 months ago, and then in the grid (p. 39) he reports that alcohol last caused the problem 1+ years ago and marijuana last caused the problem 2-12 months ago. These items are consistent because at least one substance caused the problem in the same time frame as reported on the page before the grid. But if the participant said that marijuana had last caused the problem within the past month, that item is inconsistent with the time frame reported on the page before the grid.

5. The age of first time using drugs or alcohol, reported on the page before the S9 grid (p. 38), is inconsistent with the age of first use of individual substances reported in the grid (p. 39).

Example: For item S9v on the page before the S9 grid (p. 38) the participant reports that she was 14 when she first got drunk or used any drugs. However, for S9v in the grid (p. 39) she reports first getting drunk at age 12. These responses are inconsistent and should be clarified by the interviewer.

Note: however, that in some circumstances it's possible for a participant to report a later age in the grid than on the page before. E.g., the participant first got drunk at age 12, but then in the grid she reports problems only with marijuana. She could say that she first used marijuana at 14, and because she didn't report problems with alcohol, her age of first time drunk wouldn't be asked in the grid itself.

6. Item S2s3 on p. 18 (During the past 90 days, on how many days did alcohol or drug use problems keep you from meeting your responsibilities at work, school, or home?) is inconsistent with S9h on p. 38 (When was the last time you kept using alcohol or drugs even though you knew it was keeping you from meeting your responsibilities at work, school, or home?).

Example: For item S2s3 the participant gives any number of days besides 0, but then for item S9h she reports either "1+ years ago" or "never." For the items to be consistent, the participant would have had to report "past month" or "2-12 months ago" for S9h, or she would have had to answer "0" for S2s3. The interviewer should explain the inconsistency and re-ask the items.

7. Items in the M1a-M1d series on pp. 59-60 (mental health during the past 12 months) are inconsistent with M1e on p. 61 (When was the last time that your life was significantly disturbed by nerve, mental, or psychological problems or that you felt you could not go on, including those things we just talked about?).

Example: The participant endorses several items in M1a-M1d, but then for item M1e he says that his life has never been significantly disturbed by any mental health problems (or was last significantly disturbed more than 12 months ago). For the items to be consistent, the participant

would have to say for M1e that he was last significantly disturbed by mental health issues sometime in the past 12 months. The interviewer should explain that the M1a-M1d items count for M1e and then re-administer M1e.

8. Time frames for card A or B items don't match the participant's responses to subsequent questions.

Example: For item P9 on p. 44 (When was the last time that you were bothered by health or medical problems or that they kept you from meeting your responsibilities at work, school, or home?) the participant says that she was last bothered by health problems or that health problems last kept her from meeting her responsibilities 1-3 months ago. But then for P9a and P9b the participant reports 0 days out of the past 90 on which she was bothered by health problems or that they kept her from meeting her responsibilities. The participant should have reported something for either P9a or P9b in order to for the items to be consistent with P9.

Possible inconsistencies

9. Item S3a on p. 21 (Have you ever had shaky hands, delirium tremens, convulsions, or seizures when you tried to stop, cut down on, or control your use of alcohol or drugs?) might be inconsistent with S9p on p. 38 (When was the last time you had withdrawal problems from alcohol or drugs like shaking hands, throwing up, having trouble sitting still or sleeping...?).

Example: Because items S3a and S9p don't ask about the same withdrawal symptoms, conflicting responses to the two items need to be clarified. For instance, for S3a the participant answers, "No," but then for S9p he answers, "2 to 12 months ago" (or any response besides "Never"). The interviewer should clarify to see what symptoms the participant had—it's possible that he threw up or had trouble sleeping, neither of which are asked about in S3a. Similarly, if the participant responds "Yes" to S3a but then answers "Never" to S9p, the interviewer should clarify to see whether the participant is reporting different withdrawal symptoms for the two items.

10. Items S2w5 and S2w6 on p. 19 (During the past 90 days, did you use alcohol or drugs while or within an hour prior to driving a vehicle / using knives, guns, equipment, or heavy machinery?) might be inconsistent with item S9j on p. 38 (When was the last time you used alcohol or drugs where it made the situation unsafe or dangerous for you?).

Example: For item S2w5 or S2w6 the participant says that she didn't use while or within an hour of driving a vehicle or using dangerous equipment, but then for item S9j she says that within the past month or within the past 2-12 months she's used where the situation was dangerous or unsafe. (Or vice-versa—the participant answers, "Yes" to S2w5 or S2w6 but then for S9j answers, "Never.") These items should be clarified to see whether the participant considers driving a vehicle or using knives, guns, equipment, or heavy machinery to be dangerous.

Attachment 4-7
A-QA Feedback Form Training Guide

Identifiers[†]			
Site ID (XSITE):	<i>Cover page of paper version</i>	Reviewer site:	<i>Site ID of the person writing the feedback</i>
Staff name:	<i>Name of person administering the GAIN</i>	Reviewer name:	<i>Name of person writing the feedback</i>
Staff ID (XSID):	<i>Cover page of paper version</i>	Reviewer ID:	<i>Staff ID of person writing the feedback</i>
Date of assessment (XOBSDT):	<i>Page 2 of paper version</i>	Date of review:	<i>Date on which the reviewer completes the feedback</i>
Participant ID (XPID):	<i>Cover page of paper version</i>	Assessment:	^{††}

[†] All fields should be completed.

^{††} Identify the assessment type (e.g., GAIN-I, GAIN-I Core, GAIN-M90). The specific version (e.g., ERI 5.6.0) can also be placed in this section but is not required.

Documentation

- Cover page and staff use box on page 2
 - Were the required fields (XSITE, XSID, XSIN, XPID, and XOBS) completed? If not, note which fields were not completed.
 - Was the participant's name removed from the cover page (and from all other places that it appears, such as Z3a at the end of the assessment)? If not, explain why this should be done.
 - All other personally identifying information must be removed as well, such as any full names mentioned by the participant, the participant's driver's license number, etc.
 - Was the staff use box at the top of page 2 (items A1a-d) completed correctly?
 - Were all items on the cover page and page 2 legible?
 - Remember that IDs can contain only numbers, not letters.
- Documentation and scoring of Check for Cognitive Impairment
 - Was the Check for Cognitive Impairment scored correctly?
 - Did the interviewer circle the subsections of text that the participant missed for items A3d (Please count backwards from 20 to 1), A2e (Please say the days of the week in reverse order), and A2f (Please repeat the phrase I asked you to repeat before)?
 - Were the interviewer's markings clear and legible?
- Documentation of anchors, literacy questions, and initial administration decision
 - Were the 90-day and 12-month anchors documented correctly?
 - Were the literacy questions (items A3b1 through A3b5)? coded correctly

- Was the initial administration decision (item A3c) coded correctly?
- Time to complete
 - Were the start and end times correctly documented in standard (not military) time?
 - Were all breaks documented in Z1c?
 - Were the start and stop times of each break documented in the margins of the assessment where the break occurred?
 - Was the total time to complete calculated accurately? If not, describe how the total time to complete should have been calculated.
 - If the assessment was completed over more than one day, please make any comments regarding the time to complete (section Z and XADMh1a-d) in this section.
- Urgency and Denial-Misrepresentation ratings
 - Were the UR and DM ratings coded appropriately?
 - If commenting on an interviewer's rating, be sure to include the interviewer's rating, the rating that may be a better choice, and the reason for the new rating.
 - Things to look for:
 - If all DM ratings are NO, some sections may not be coded correctly. Most participants will necessarily have to do some estimating in at least one or two sections because it's difficult to remember exact figures for a 90-day period.
 - If a UR code of NOW is used, is it used appropriately?
- Administration ratings
 - Are the administration ratings (XADM) at the end of the assessment completed and accurately coded?
 - If not coded correctly, what is wrong and how should the item be coded? And why?
- Documentation of participant responses
 - Were all items documented legibly?
 - Were staff notes used to document additional information (if necessary)?
 - Were DK (don't know) and RF (refused) used appropriately?
 - Comments on items that the interviewer is permitted to code on their own (e.g., the A4a1-99 "presenting concerns" code) should be placed under this subheading, as well as items that the interviewer should not code without asking the participant (such as presuming the participant's response).
 - Were changes made correctly (original response cleanly crossed out, new response written neatly, and initialed and dated)? If not, note the correct way to make a correction. Include item numbers where corrections were made correctly and incorrectly.
 - Were all mentioned items not named by the participant coded "no"?
 - Any items that were miscoded should be placed in this section. For example, if the participant responded "yes," but "no" was coded, it would be noted here.
 - Verbatim responses that were not documented correctly should be placed in this section. The reviewer should compare the participant's actual statement to what the interviewer wrote down.
 - Any items that were administered but not documented should be noted in this section.
 - Any items that were documented but that were not administered should be noted in this section.

- Be sure to balance this section with both positive comments and suggestions for things that need improvement.

Summary rating: Choose one. Give only the rating, not the criteria for the rating that appears below.

Excellent: Use of legible, selective notes to facilitate later review by clinicians or researchers

Sufficient: Everything is completed accurately and clearly

Minor problems: Some missing or incorrect items or documentation errors

Problems: Major sections left incomplete or completed incorrectly

Instructions

- Introduction (purpose, format, length, privacy, confidentiality)
 - Were all major points of the introduction (page 2 on the paper version of the GAIN-I) explained? If not, note what was omitted.
 - Did the interviewer read “We have obtained a certificate of confidentiality...” unnecessarily? The statement should be read only when the interviewer’s site has actually obtained a certificate of confidentiality.
 - Did the interviewer conclude the introduction by asking the participant, “Do you have any questions?”
- Administration of Check for Cognitive Impairment
 - Were all parts of the Check for Cognitive Impairment administered correctly
- Establishing time frames and anchors (main time frames and S2x)
 - Were the instructions for establishing the anchors read completely?
 - Did the interviewer and participant count back 13 weeks (for the 90-day anchor) and 12 months to find the correct dates to establish the anchors?
 - Was the “When we talk about things happening during the past [90 days / 12 months]” statement read after each anchor was established?
 - Were the anchors established with the participant positive or neutral? Negative anchors (deaths, illnesses, breakups, etc.) should not be used because the participant will be reminded of the event throughout the interview.
 - If the S2x Pre–Controlled-Environment Use grid is administered, a comment on how well the interviewer established and anchored this time period would be noted in this section.
- Additional instructions for oral administration
 - Were all the additional instructions for oral administration (page 5 of the paper copy) read to the participant?
- Reading scales and transitional statements
 - Were all the scales read? Scales tell the participant how to respond to certain items: yes or no; number of times, days, or episodes; true or false; etc.
 - Were all the transitional statements read? These are the statements describing each section and what information should be included in the participant’s responses. For example, in the Substance Use section the participant is instructed, “Please do not include any prescription drugs you use or used under the direction of a doctor.”

- Using the cards and defining response choices
 - Were cards used properly during the assessment?
 - If the participant responds initially with a number from a card, did the interviewer check to make sure that the number matches the intended response (e.g., the participant uses 1 to mean “more than 12 months ago”)? Did the interviewer clarify the response the first time that the participant used a number from a card to ensure that the participant was using the cards correctly?
 - Were response choices defined when necessary? That is, did the interviewer explain the different responses if the participant was having trouble understanding how to answer, or did the interviewer explain the differences between the different time frames?
 - Were the appropriate items (e.g., E1, V7) administered as clarify-and-code items? Were any items administered as clarify-and-code that should not have been?
- Responding to participant questions about instructions
 - Did the participant ask any questions about any of the instructions given during the assessment? If the participant asked questions, the inclusion in the feedback of the question and the response given by the interviewer, whether correct or needing improvement, would be helpful.
 - If the participant did not ask any questions about the instructions, it would be appropriate to write, “The participant did not ask any questions about the instructions” in this section of the feedback.

Summary rating: Choose one. Give only the rating, not the criteria for the rating that appears below.

Excellent: Interviewer’s instructions are individualized and used to better engage the participant, particularly with regard to establishing the anchors

Sufficient: All instructions are correctly followed

Minor problems: Some missing or incorrect instructions

Problems: Many missing or incorrect instructions

Items

- Accurate following of item order and skips
 - Were all skips followed throughout the assessment? If any skips were missed, list them in this section.
 - Was item order followed? When items are asked out of order, it should be noted in this section. (If the interviewer catches the error and administers the skipped item, it could be noted as a positive comment.)
- Accurate grid administration
 - Was the S2 grid administered correctly? When the participant reported using substances during the past 90 days, did the interviewer ask the corresponding items through the rest of the S2 grid?
 - Be sure that items in column 2 of the S2 grid (About how many drinks/joints/etc. did you have in one day?) are clarified before coding. For example, if the participant reports having 12 drinks, did the interviewer clarify by asking what the participant

was drinking and what size the drinks were, using the conversion chart at the bottom of the page to standardize the answer?

- If the S2x grid was administered, did the interviewer correctly ask the items as they pertain to the new time frame?
- If the S7 grid was administered, was it administered correctly? Did the interviewer start the grid with the participant's first treatment episode and work toward their most recent?
- Was the S9 grid administered correctly? After the participant endorsed items on the first page, did the interviewer ask the corresponding items on the next page?
- Accurate following of word order
 - It is very important to include comments about wording changes that alter the meaning of an item. For example, if the interviewer reads item S2s1a as, "During the past 90 days, on how many days did you use any alcohol, marijuana, or other drugs?" instead of the correct "on how many days did you go *without* using any alcohol, marijuana, or other drugs," the interviewer should note what the interviewer said and what should have been said.
 - Frequent word-order changes, even if they don't affect the meaning of an item, should be noted to ensure that the interviewer doesn't begin to change wording past the point of preserving the meaning of an item.
- Appropriate use of stems and anchors
 - Were stems read at the beginning of lists of items throughout the assessment?
 - Were stems repeated during long lists of items to remind the participant of the focus of the items?
 - Did the interviewer appropriately use the participant's personal anchors during the assessment? Did the interviewer use the anchors frequently at the beginning of the assessment, when beginning a new section, or when switching between time frames?
- Appropriate use of parenthetical statements
 - Was parenthetical material used appropriately? Did the interviewer read only enough parenthetical material that seemed appropriate to help the participant (for example, if the participant appeared to need examples or asked for clarification)?
 - If all parenthetical material is being read and prolonging the assessment, address that issue in this section. Examples of this would be reading all the parenthetical material listing drug descriptions in the S2 grid or reading all the parenthetical descriptions of ailments for items P10a-s when doing so was clearly unnecessary.
- Clarification of participant responses for coding
 - Did the interviewer administer mentioned items correctly? Mentioned items should be administered by asking the item, then coding the participant's responses (clarifying if necessary) and asking "Any others?" until the participant has nothing else to report.
 - Did the interviewer ask "Any others?" after verbatim items when necessary? For instance, if the participant gives a response to item P13a99 (Do you currently want help with anything else related to your health situation?), the interviewer should continue to ask, "Any others?" until the participant reports needing help for nothing else related to their health situation.
 - Did the interviewer accidentally ask "Any others?" after items that don't require it, such as item A4a (In a few words, can you tell me why you are here today? What is

- your main or most important reason for coming to treatment?) or item S9ad (What is your main or most important reason for wanting to quit now?)?
- Did the interviewer clarify vague responses correctly? If so, exact dialogue is helpful.
 - Some examples of issues that would be included in this section:
 - If the participant used vague words such as “maybe,” “around,” etc., did the interviewer clarify for a more precise response by asking, e.g., “So what would you like me to put down”?
 - Did the interviewer clarify responses such as “four or five days” or “10 or 20 times” to get a firm response? Only one number can be recorded for any answer that requires a number.
 - If the participant answered with a fraction (“Five and a half hours”), did the interviewer clarify for a whole number?
 - If the item asked for a number of days and the participant responded using times instead, did the interviewer correctly clarify how many days the participant wanted coded?
 - If the participant responded outside the desired format, did the interviewer clarify the response? (For example, “uh-huh” instead of “yes,” “nuh-uh” instead of “no,” “none” instead of “zero.”)
 - If the participant responds, “every day,” “half,” “all of them,” “every other day,” “last night,” “yesterday,” “2 weeks,” “1 month,” etc., did the interviewer clarify to receive a number of days or a number of times in order to properly code the response?
 - If the participant answers, “a year ago” for a card A item, did the interviewer clarify to see whether the participant meant “4 to 12 months ago” or “more than 12 months ago”?
 - Similarly, for card B items, if the participant responded with “a year ago,” did the interviewer clarify for whether the participant meant “2 to 12 months ago” or “more than 12 months ago”?
 - Keep in mind that all responses should come from the participant. Sometimes interviewers may have information about the participant and will code items on their own or without sufficiently clarifying. Interviewers may also lead the participant to the correct response, or they will suggest the correct response and the participant will agree. It is still considered leading if the interviewer gives or suggests the correct response to the participant, even though the participant may agree.
 - Be sure that item B2b (Who currently has legal custody of you?) is clarified fully. For example, if the participant responds, “my mom,” and the interviewer codes “a single parent” without probing further, it might not be the correct response option for this participant’s situation because participants are more likely to name the parent they currently live with instead of who has custody of them. The interviewer should clarify the participant’s response in order to select the most appropriate code.
 - Be sure that item E1 (What kind of housing do you currently live in?) is clarified fully if more than one response may apply. Many times, the participant will offer only the type of housing and whom they are living with, such as, “in an apartment.” Clarification is needed to see whom the participant lives with and whether the apartment is rent-subsidized or public housing.
 - Responding to participant questions about items

- Did the participant ask any questions about the items on the GAIN during the assessment? Such questions would include asking for a definition of a word, an explanation of what the question means, or examples of what would apply in a response.
- If the participant asks a specific question, be sure to include the question and whether the interviewer answered it appropriately or how the question should be answered in the future.
- If the participant did not ask any questions about the items, it would be appropriate to write, “The participant did not ask any questions about items” in this section of the feedback.
- Resolving inconsistencies
 - An inconsistency occurs when the participant’s answers to two separate items contain conflicting information that cannot simultaneously be true. The reviewer must write up all inconsistencies.
 - Example: for item E5 (During the past 12 months, how many people would you say you have regularly lived with?) the participant reports living with zero people, but for item V11r (How many people are there in your family household?) the participant says that there were six people in their family household. The two items conflict—it can’t be true that the participant both lived with no one during the past 12 months and currently had 6 people in her family household.
 - Placement in the feedback of comments about inconsistencies can get confused with the subheading “Clarification of participant responses.”
 - A clarification issue arises when a participant gives an ambiguous answer that must be clarified before it can be coded.
 - An inconsistency, as noted above, occurs when the participant’s answers to two separate items contain conflicting information, and both answers cannot simultaneously be true.
 - An inconsistency can also be identified from side conversation—for instance, the participant reports not having worked in the past 12 months but then offhandedly mentions having a job, which is a contradiction—so listen closely to any additional information that the participant gives during the interview.
 - The top 10 inconsistencies list (attachment 4-6 in the GAIN manual) can be very helpful with identifying inconsistencies. If you are not familiar with the items that correspond to one another and are most frequently the source of inconsistencies, the top 10 list is a valuable tool for writing clear, precise feedback.
 - When writing up a comment about an inconsistency, please include the item and page numbers of the inconsistent items (usually two but occasionally more), the responses that were given for each, and how to clear up the items in the future.
 - Inconsistencies that are caught and clarified can be included as positive feedback: include the item and page numbers of the inconsistent items, the responses that the participant gave for both, and the strategy that the interviewer used to resolve them.
 - Possible inconsistencies should also be noted in this section. A possible inconsistency is when two or more items appear to be inconsistent but could actually be consistent, but there is not enough information to tell without further clarification. For instance, a participant might state for item A4c that their probation officer referred them to

treatment, but then for item B4c they report feeling no pressure from their probation officer to go to treatment. The responses to the two items appear inconsistent, but the interviewer should clarify to make sure (for instance, it's possible that the participant's probation officer may have referred them to treatment but that they weren't pressuring the participant to attend).

Summary rating: Choose one. Give only the rating, not the criteria for the rating that appears below.

- Excellent:* Interviewer repeats items and time frames, defines terms, or does other things to increase the validity of the responses
- Sufficient:* No problems with the administration of the items that would affect the validity of the recorded information
- Minor problems:* Some minor changes in meaning, item wording, or time frames; unclear clarification; missing issues that require clarification
- Problems:* Repeated difficulties that result in missing information or problems with validity

Engagement

- Flow of the interview
 - How was the rhythm of the assessment? Was the flow steady or were there long pauses, choppy reading, or pauses while reading instructions or finding the next item? Keep in mind that even the best interviewer will have some pauses while documenting items, turning the pages, and making staff notes.
 - Was the pace of the interview appropriate for the participant? The interviewer should speak fast enough that the participant stays engaged but not so fast that the participant has trouble keeping up.
- Appropriate voice articulation and inflection
 - Pronunciation of words should be clear.
 - Stressing boldfaced words and important words and phrases can help add meaning and comprehension.
 - Be sure to mention if an interviewer uses a monotone voice throughout the interview. Oftentimes the interviewer will not be aware of this issue until it is pointed out.
- Use of encouraging or motivational statements
 - Did the interviewer offer any encouraging or motivating statements to the participant? Examples include: "Thank you for your patience," "We're moving right along," and "Thanks for hanging in there."
 - Did the interviewer keep the participant informed of where they were in the assessment (e.g., "We just finished the longest section," "We're about halfway through," "We're starting the last section")? Include the statements that the interviewer makes, and make suggestions for positive comments that they can use in the future.
- Sensitivity to participant needs
 - Did the interviewer check in with the participant from time to time and make sure that they were doing well?

- Did the interviewer offer breaks without the participant having to ask first?
- If the participant had difficulty with a certain section, did the interviewer express empathy for the participant?
- Rapport
 - Did the interviewer act professionally?
 - Was the interviewer approachable and friendly?
 - Did the interviewer refer to the participant by name to add a more personal touch?
 - Was the interviewer patient when the participant did not understand an item?
 - Did the interviewer ever thank the participant for their responses?

Summary rating: Choose one. Give only the rating, not the criteria for the rating that appears below.

Excellent: Interviewer engages participant and manages the interview well, increasing validity and making the interview less burdensome on the participant

Sufficient: The interviewer engages the participant with good rapport

Minor problems: Ignoring inattentiveness, misunderstandings, or inconsistencies; not offering encouragement where needed; reading or moving through the interview too fast

Problems: Arguing with participant; ignoring participant's questions or emotional state

Other

General comments that don't fit any of the above categories, such as comments on the interviewer's evaluative statements, the audibility of the recording, and supplemental questions that aren't included as part of the regular GAIN interview, are included in this section.

Certification status: Pending or certified (choose only one)

Pending: Any summary ratings are below sufficient

Certified: All summary ratings are sufficient or above

Notes

- Remember the cardinal rule: every comment you write should help trainees understand where they made an error, how they made that error, and what they can do to avoid the same error in future interviews.
- Make sure that the feedback is balanced between positive comments and things that need improvement. Bear in mind that while feedback will detail primarily those areas in which the interviewer needs improvement, each subsection of the feedback should include positive statements as well to act as positive reinforcement. Each comment should make it clear whether improvement is needed or whether the interviewer did a good job.
- Pay particular attention to the following subsections:
 - Documentation of participant answers

- Accurate following of item order and skips
- Clarification of participant responses for coding
- Resolving inconsistencies

These tend to be the most important sections of GAIN A-QA feedback, so comments in should be written especially clearly and thoroughly.

- Be sure that comments read smoothly. It's a good idea to complete the feedback, put it away for a couple of hours, and then come back to it fresh and make sure that every comment is clear. Feedback should be written so that someone only slightly familiar with the GAIN should be able to interpret all the reviewer's comments without picking up the GAIN instrument itself, such as by including applicable item text.
- Each comment should use exact dialogue from the interview whenever possible to explain a situation, whether done well or needing improvement. For things that need improvement, be sure to note how the interviewer should make improvements by giving examples, or describe the situation that occurred and what the interviewer could have said or done differently in order to collect the most accurate information.

Questions to consider before finalizing A-QA feedback

- Were item and page numbers (if using the paper version of the GAIN) included with the comments?
- Were comments bulleted to provide clear information?
- Were enough positive comments included to balance the feedback?
- Are all the comments in complete sentences?
- Would the comments make sense to someone without a lot of experience with the GAIN?
- Ask yourself, "If I were reading this feedback, would I understand what I did wrong, why it was wrong, and what I should have done instead?"

Attachment 4-8

GAIN Submission Form

Interviewer Name: _____

Interviewer ID: _____

Business Address: _____

Business Phone: _____

Business E-mail Address: _____

Project Name (if applicable): _____
(Grant or project type such as TCE/HIV, TDC, YORP, AAFT, or Wyoming)

Training Attended: _____
(Date and location)

Site ID: _____

Site City/State: _____

Attempt Number: _____
(Total number of submissions you have made for the Administrator OR Local Trainer certification process)

Have you made a COPY to submit and kept the original?

YES NO

Have you written your name, return address, and phone number on the tape or tape case inserts?

YES NO

Have you reviewed your documentation to make sure everything is complete and accurate?

YES NO

Have you listened to your tape to determine whether the entire submission is audible?

YES NO

For Local Trainer Submissions Only:

Local Trainer Name: _____

Local Trainer ID: _____

Please send **tapes** along with a **COPY** of the assessment to:

QA Team
c/o Chestnut Health Systems
448 Wylie Drive
Normal IL 61761-0078