

Recommended Reading List
Building Strong Evidence in Challenging Contexts:
Alternatives to Traditional Randomized Controlled Trials
September 22 and 23, 2016 – Washington, DC

General/Background

- Fok, C. C. T., Henry, D., & Allen, J. (2015). Research designs for intervention research with small samples II: Stepped wedge and interrupted time-series designs. *Prevention Science, 16*(7), 967–977. doi:10.1007/s11121-015-0569-4
- Murray, D. M., Pennell, M., Rhoda, D., Hade, E. M., & Paskett, E. D. (2010). Designing studies that would address the multilayered nature of health care. *JNCI Monographs, 2010*(40), 90–96. doi:10.1093/jncimonographs/lgq014
- Sanson-Fisher, R. W., D'Este, C. A., Carey, M. L., Noble, N., & Paul, C. L. (2014). Evaluation of systems-oriented public health interventions: Alternative research designs. *Annual Review of Public Health, 35*(1), 9–27. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-032013-182445

Working with Communities to Design Research and Evaluations

- Chung, B., Jones, L., Dixon, E. L., Miranda, J., Wells, K., & Community Partners in Care Steering (2010). Using a community partnered participatory research approach to implement a Randomized controlled trial: Planning community partners in care. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved, 21*(3), 780–795. doi:10.1353/hpu.0.0345
- Goodman, L. A., Cattaneo, L. B., Thomas, K., Woulfe, J., Chong, S. K., & Smyth, K. F. (2015). Advancing domestic violence program evaluation: Development and validation of the measure of victim empowerment related to safety (MOVERS). *Psychology of Violence, 5*(4), 355–366. doi:10.1037/a0038318

Working with Small Samples

- Bertsimas, D., Johnson, M., & Kallus, N. (2015). The power of optimization over randomization in designing experiments involving small samples. *Operations Research, 63*(4), 868–876. doi:10.1287/opre.2015.1361
- Fienberg, S.E. (2011). "Bayesian models and methods in public policy and government settings." *Statistical Science 26*(2): 212-226.
- Finucane, M.M, Martinez, I., & Cody, S. (2015). What Works for Whom? A Bayesian Approach to Channeling Big Data Streams for Policy Analysis. Working Paper No. 40. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research.
- Flam, F. D. (2014). "The odds, continually updated." *The New York Times, Science Times, 2014*: 9-30.
- Horner, R. H., Carr, E. G., Halle, J., McGee, G., Odom, S., & Wolery, M. (2005). The use of single-subject research to identify evidence-based practice in special education. *Exceptional Children, 71*(2), 165–179. doi:10.1177/001440290507100203
- Kallus, N. (under review). Optimal a priori balance in the design of controlled experiments. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*.
- Lane, J. D., Ledford, J. R., & Gast, D. L. (in press). Single case design: Current standards and applications in occupational therapy. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 71*.

Alternative Forms of Randomization

- Angrist, J. D., & Pischke, J-S. (2014). Instrumental variables. In *Mastering metrics: The path from cause to effect* (pp. 98-146). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Angrist, J. D., & Pischke, J-S. (2014). Randomized trials. In *Mastering metrics: The path from cause to effect* (pp. 1-46). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Corrigan, P. W., & Salzer, M. S. (2003). The conflict between random assignment and treatment preference: Implications for internal validity. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 26*(2), 109–121. doi:10.1016/s0149-7189(03)00014-4
- He, Y., Gewirtz, A., Lee, S., Morrell, N., & August, G. (2015). A randomized preference trial to inform personalization of a parent training program implemented in community mental health clinics. *Translational Behavioral Medicine, 6*(1), 73–80. doi:10.1007/s13142-015-0366-4
- Hughes, J. P., Granston, T. S., & Heagerty, P. J. (2015). Current issues in the design and analysis of stepped wedge trials. *Contemporary Clinical Trials, 45*, 55–60. doi:10.1016/j.cct.2015.07.006
- Marcus, S. M., Stuart, E. A., Wang, P., Shadish, W. R., & Steiner, P. M. (2012). Estimating the causal effect of randomization versus treatment preference in a doubly randomized preference trial. *Psychological Methods, 17*(2), 244–254. doi:10.1037/a0028031

When Randomization is Not Possible

- Angrist, J. D., & Rokkanen, M. (2015). Wanna get away? Regression discontinuity estimation of exam school effects away from the cutoff. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 110*:512, 1331-1344. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2015.1012259
- Bloom, Howard S., et al. "Promoting Work in Public Housing. The Effectiveness of Jobs-Plus. Final Report." *MDRC* (2005).
- Gruber, J., & Simon, K. (2008). Crowd-out 10 years later: Have recent public insurance expansions crowded out private health insurance? *Journal of Health Economics, 27*(2), 201–217. doi:10.1016/j.jhealeco.2007.11.004
- Riccio, J. A. (2010). Sustained Earnings Gains for Residents in a Public Housing Jobs Program: Seven-Year Findings from the Jobs-Plus Demonstration. Policy Brief. *MDRC*.
- Stuart, E. A., & Hanna, D. B. (2013). Should epidemiologists be more sensitive to design sensitivity? *Epidemiology, 24*(1), 88–89. doi:10.1097/ede.0b013e3182782468
- Wing, C., & Cook, T. D. (2013). Strengthening the regression discontinuity design using additional design elements: A within-study comparison. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 32* (4), 853-877. doi: 10.1002/pam.21721
- Wong, V.C., Wing, C., & Martin, D. (2016). *Did states use implementation discretion to reduce the stringency of NCLB? Evidence from a database of state regulations* (EdPolicy Works Working Paper Series No. 51). Retrieved from http://curry.virginia.edu/uploads/resourceLibrary/51_States_Implementation_Responses_to_NCLB.pdf
- Wong, V.C., Valentine, J., & Miller-Bains, K. (2016). *Empirical performance of covariates in education observational studies* (EdPolicy Works Working Paper Series No. 45). Retrieved from http://curry.virginia.edu/uploads/resourceLibrary/45_Covariate_Performance_in_Observational_Studies.pdf

- Zubizarreta, J. R., Cerdá, M., & Rosenbaum, P. R. (2013). Effect of the 2010 Chilean earthquake on Posttraumatic stress. *Epidemiology*, 24(1), 79–87. doi:10.1097/ede.0b013e318277367e

Federal Efforts and Future Directions

- Athey, S., & Imbens, G. W. (2016, July). The state of applied econometrics: Causality and policy evaluation. Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.00699>
- Corporation for National and Community Service. *Evaluation Plan Guidance: A Step-by-Step Guide to Designing a Rigorous Evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalservice.gov/sites/default/files/documents/SIF%20Evaluation%20guidance%208%205%202014.pdf> [This document includes a detailed checklist for writing an impact evaluation plan, references and links to resources for each section of the plan, and sample formats for logic models, timelines, budgets, and a glossary of research terms.]
- Corporation for National and Community Service, Office of Research and Evaluation. (2013). *Budgeting for Rigorous Evaluation: Insights from the Social Innovation Fund*. (by Lily Zandniapour and Nicole Vicinanza). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nationalservice.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Budgeting_for_Evaluation.pdf [This document includes guidance and tips around how to develop a detailed budget for evaluation.]
- Corporation for National and Community Service. *The Impact Evaluability Assessment Tool*. Retrieved from http://www.nationalservice.gov/sites/default/files/resource/FR_SIFImpactEvaluabilityAssessmentTool_Final_2016.pdf [This checklist covers the range of necessary elements for conducting an impact study on programs of interest, including Organization Readiness, Program Readiness, and Evaluation Readiness.]
- Corporation for National and Community Service, Office of Research and Evaluation (2014). *Social Innovation Fund's Rubric for Identifying Subgrantee Applicants' Incoming Level of Evidence*. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalservice.gov/sites/default/files/resource/SIF-Rubric-Assessing-levels-of-evidence.12.19.14.pdf> [this document is a rubric that allows programs and stakeholders to develop a shared understanding of how evidence level of studies are reviewed to determine what tier of evidence they fall under.]
- Li, F., Likhnygina, Y., Murray, D. M., Heagerty, P. J., & DeLong, E. R. (2015). An evaluation of constrained randomization for the design and analysis of group-randomized trials. *Statistics in Medicine*, 35(10), 1565–1579. doi:10.1002/sim.6813
- What Works Clearinghouse Preview of Regression Discontinuity Design Standards (18 pages). Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences, U. S. Department of Education, December 2015. [<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/documentsum.aspx?sid=258>, accessed 8/29/2016]
- U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, What Works Clearinghouse. (2013, March). What Works Clearinghouse: Procedures and Standards Handbook (Version 3.0). Retrieved from <http://whatworks.ed.gov> (pages 1-21 only)

Note: The majority of papers included in this list were recommended for further reading by the meeting speakers.