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Process monitoring in prevention trials

- Purposes: interpretation, dissemination
- Measures: fidelity, quality, emerging problems
- Characteristics: multilevel
Previous studies: three models

- Ignored
- Reported (in methods section)
- Analysed (separate papers)
  - Description
  - As part of outcome interpretation
Principles of process monitoring include:

- Eco-ergonomics
- Fidelity
- Control condition surveillance
- Critical issues
- Cultural adaptation
Report system

- Structured forms
  - Units (12)
  - Peers (7)
  - Parents (3)
  - Additional/alternative programs (2)

- Mail, fax, e-mail

- Reminders
Compliance with the report system
(final data 9 centres)

% classes with reports

Core units  Parents  Peer meetings  Other programs

Oct 05, 7 centres
Criteria and indicators

- **Coverage**
  - % non implementing
  - % completed program
  - % reached or participating

- **Fidelity**
  - % implemented components

- **Performance**
  - Time for conduction
  - % highly rated
Program coverage according to 3 indicators
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**% classes not impl**, **% classes whole program**, **% pop reached**
Implementation of Core Units
(Final data Dec 05, 9 centres)
Core units performance: conduction time

Average time per program core unit in 9 centres
(Dec 05)
Core units performance: teachers’ rating

% high/very high

Core units

Interactivity  Students' interest  Teacher's confidence
Core units: conclusions

- Medium level of fidelity
- Acceptable reach
- High performance
- Variation between centres and units
- Content and amount of tasks needs revision before dissemination
Complementary components: peers (P2P)

- Peers: low degree of report/implementation

Program implementation among reporting centres
Complementary components: parents’ meetings

- Highly implemented (70% complete)
- Highly rated (lecture)
- Overlooked but highly rated (role plays)
- **Low attendance!**
The overall system

- Reporting system feasible and informative
- Reporting attitude influenced by application
- Clarity, timing and accessibility for delivery important
- Large variations between centres
The overall program

- **Program critical points**
  - Base curriculum: length of units, cultural adaptation
  - Peers: training and clarity of tasks
  - Parents: strategies of involvement

- **Other suggestions**
  - Incorporate monitoring data in analysis of effects
  - Monitor the surveiller!