

Speaker 1 ([00:00](#)):

That we have an opportunity to do 5 3 20. And so just to say this thing,

Speaker 1 ([00:07](#)):

I think it was Horner initially said that an evidence-based practice can be defined by any practice that produces a positive outcome across at least five studies, three different research sites, all sorts of nuance that kind of show up about what constitutes evidence. Two demonstrations out of three all because this entire conference is relevant to whether or not Mandy need case, you can generate an evidence in each practice. So we're paying really close attention to it, but as we've looked through the different definitions of piece, first thing I say out loud is a shout out to Timko and people who don't believe that EP is a noun and it's a verb and it's max. So judgment and client values and best available, whether or not you want to call this EVP or peer supportive treatment, I'm good with it. Most definitions of this concept have a 5, 3 20. Some of them like the steinbrenner review, have added a clause when they say three distinct researchers, the three distinct investigators they add or research groups. And so that felt to us when we first, oh we can do 5 3 20 and then we read this definition and we're like, oh wait a second. Are we a research group?

Speaker 1 ([01:28](#)):

And if we're a research group, well shit, what a waste of resources. What a unique opportunity we have to come together and really bang out a lot of potentially high quality research on a technique or an approach that didn't exist. Find it. Right. So that's going to be, we have a series of questions that we want to ask in relation to the utility of functional independence cross research groups and what parameters and protections we can put into place that would allow us to meet the spirit of a stipulation like this while also capitalizing on the fact that we have three different researchers who have come together and agreed to coordinate work together on for the next three years and put out a bunch of high blood research. So that is kind of the motivation behind all of this sound about right? Yeah.

Speaker 2 ([02:23](#)):

Yeah. And so I think this gets back to multi-site collaborations and so sometimes those are required by funders. Sometimes you're developing a technology that only your team has access to and so you cannot actually evaluate the practice except within this collaboration. That's sort of the situation we find ourselves in. There's also, have you all heard of Sarah? The special education research accelerator that Bill Theon and Brian Cook started? So the idea there is around RCTs, but it's basically crowdsourcing researchers to follow protocols jointly across the country to be able to build an evidence-based in a transparent and open science sort of an approach. But that also gets into this issue of, okay, well now are they also a group and so are they generating evidence-based practices? And if our goal is to generate an evidence-based practice, how do we make sure that's the mission and not the semantics around groups?

Speaker 2 ([03:22](#)):

On the other hand, if we only have a practice that can be replicated by one group, then that's a problem. And so there's this tension between multiple collaborators and then independents as well. So we don't know what to do. So we're here to get your insight. So we do have some questions to prompt us, but I think also we'll have time maybe 20 minutes, so we should have time for your questions and discussion too. So I don't want this to limit conversation. So the first one is your thoughts. How should a research group be defined?

Speaker 3 ([04:04](#)):

Well, I don't know if I have quite straightaway answer to this, but my first initial thought about what Georgia said is you are considered multi site but you're not considered a three independent research groups. I think that's the part the problem, and I hate to steal, steal away some of your Sunday here when this idea popped out in other fields incorporates as well not specific special ed or education, clinical psychology, psychiatry, biomedical sciences, that also pick on this idea that there are independent sites and this is this verification and the emphasis is on independence because the verification should be unbiased, be a team of a researcher or a layer that is disconnected that is not connected with the people who originated the intervention or the initial developers or provided the initial demonstration of an intervention effect. The idea is fortunately in this context, it's all about an independent verification of what the original research group had produced. So maybe at the core of the problem here is not so much how to be operationalized but how could you get to that level or bring in other sites one where there are no people, none of your people are involved with this that,

Speaker 3 ([05:38](#)):

And I think that that's a big challenge. Most applications that I see in our fields, there's always some of the original involved because they are our students. There are postdocs collaborate on variant before. So in that original sense, from what count as evidence-based practice, that's not how it was meant

Speaker 1 ([06:01](#)):

To repeat. Back to you, just to make sure, so you've confirmed our unfortunately, which is that we cannot be considered independent because all three of us have,

Speaker 3 ([06:12](#)):

You have a multi site yet one same extent.

Speaker 4 ([06:16](#)):

So a multi-site grant, you never had brand together or you had a multi-site grant that intentionally creates a different case.

Speaker 5 ([06:26](#)):

I think there's something more nuance 5 3 20 is very arbitrary and it's like what if you have practitioners that are the implementers and they're in all kinds of different places geographically would that work if you have a treatment that's really has a really well standardized protocol that's very different than something that's again has more adaptations and things like that as part of it, I think that the whole idea of replications is really important and independent replications is really important, but this is really pretty arbitrary this whole 5 3 20 and I'm not sure that you need to worry about it that much, especially if you're in the development stage.

Speaker 4 ([07:24](#)):

Yeah, it makes me think about the conversations that have come compare around non concurrent and helpful baseline designs and that idea of need to be in place to protect internal validity In the context of that discussion, I almost wonder if it could be something like researchers that are independent in it least two of these three possible ways or three of these five possible ways. There's different places geographic, different practitioners implemented a list and if you meet at least X number of them during

Speaker 2 ([08:04](#)):

Yeah, so the focus is getting back on independent replication rather than these arbitrary guidelines that have been posted.

Speaker 1 ([08:13](#)):

Is it fair to ask? Well, I'm curious to know if there's a list of five possible ways to establish and I'd love to get a sense of what you all talk about. I don't just say drive that I want where you're going,

Speaker 4 ([08:33](#)):

Just thinking about conflict. If Mandy and I were going to do something together, you would probably say you're not. But I do think that there's something about transparency, practice certified even so that if a protocol was delivered to an investigator, even if you're reporting a conflict, maybe have a long conversation to about our relationship with another positionality and then the independence come with a level of third party verifier. Somebody that's totally independent that says, I actually went to site visit. It does really look like they're following their protocol when he's not sharing data with especially they're not talking about that some way for to get around issue of okay, yeah, maybe independent person.

Speaker 6 ([09:54](#)):

I also wonder if you can actually take this pragmatically that you say that you define the parameters researchers the level of inductive findings if then with your own, let's say you have response guided decision making with your research designs and two or three independent individuals did the same thing without communication with each other. Those branders were said you now have a level of induction where you have 1, 2, 3 things that occurred independent of verbal behavior communication with one strength that these approach is you're adding.

Speaker 4 ([10:36](#)):

I also think in some, I don't know if you're history, but some of the things that you come up with are going to be a function of you guys have some shared

Speaker 4 ([10:43](#)):

Which PhD programs grad together. So the adaptations that you come up with naturally that when the intervention's not working, if you don't talk about them, that's a really good IOA that we're pushing towards evidence based practice without relying on, hey, I really like the independent site. I don't think you can't remove your learning history, your history, you had the same advisor. Same. Well that was a extreme example. I think it would be hard to say that you could achieve in some Yeah, but between the two of you, I think maybe there are enough different to say that you could verify.

Speaker 2 ([11:23](#)):

Yeah, I mean I think part of the issue is that some of these interventions that are developed through multi-site collaborations have to start in the development phase within those collaborative partners. And so finding a way to disclose or clarify how we were on the same team but also independent is helpful and I guess that's part of what I'm wondering is what is independent? How independent is independent. I don't know. I think it's like

Speaker 3 ([11:52](#)):

These different sides that is staying away from the initial development and is just being task with doing a follow up observation or follow up study. They are top nine what we call it development stage. Yeah,

Speaker 2 ([12:13](#)):

So you have another team.

Speaker 3 ([12:17](#)):

We define that as different research.

Speaker 4 ([12:24](#)):

Are you all trying to much one kind development need get point accomplishment? Could you just not worry about your independence and spend time together? Probably.

Speaker 1 ([12:35](#)):

Yeah, I think it's big opportunities. It wasn't but we're giving half a decade of our lives to this thing and I'm just trying to be mindful of God, it would've been great to have thought about this in year one. So could have put protections into place and contribute to the serendipitous synergy that exists across every, I don't know if this is ever going to have an event, so we just kind want to let you grab it and take it for what it's worth. And there's all of these, we all have a conflict of interest but we all are actively developing and if we can't contribute to EDP, that's totally fine. The question is can we

Speaker 5 ([13:13](#)):

Or

Speaker 1 ([13:13](#)):

What can we do? What will we, I really like the idea of getting third party after stipulating what, what's valuable about independence that we could preserve with protection? Maybe that's

Speaker 5 ([13:36](#)):

A really key question. What is it that this part of this equation actually controls? Why is that? I mean can sort of see the three and the point because they go together. The more replications across individuals you have that demonstrate some diversity in geography is only one of those dimensions that those two do go together. This three independent research groups or whatever, it doesn't really make a whole lot of sense because we're a small field, we all have conflicts of interest. If we don't know somebody who's doing similar work, we will by the end of this for grant, right? That's sort of the nature of what we deal with all the time. When we're doing reviews or grants and articles and stuff like that, we know the people that are doing similar work. It's so hard to get around that issue. And among in this equation, the three is the one that's sort of the stumbling block and it's like why do we make it so hard for single case designs to be a way to demonstrate evidence-based practices? We set the bar much higher than we often do.

Speaker 6 ([14:57](#)):

Me too. That we're trying to create something that's artificial where when you look at it, those three typically are influenced by one of them even though it may not be disclosed when they published. I know what I do research or try to replicate. I'll reach out to the authors and be like, Hey, quick question

on this. So there is some influence from outside sources that may not be reported but it still because I one read,

Speaker 5 ([15:22](#)):

Right?

Speaker 6 ([15:23](#)):

So I wonder if there's some benefits. My priority rules of we're going to collaborate on year one since said it half a decade where we do this together in either one. Then once we have the general idea of where we're going, then you divide it out year to come back during year five or something like that where you do kind of get the ball rolling together, separate the independence and then come back with some of those contingencies of we have a site visit to ensure that it is truly independent. Some of those features of all these things need to be, or at least two or three of these 10 have to occur for independence, but you might be able to stack into your favor that kind of how even go about replicating because I'd be surprised if a lot of times people don't reach out to the original author and they replicate or get some data sheets or something as they're trying to replicate something.

Speaker 4 ([16:15](#)):

The data safety monitor board, could you add some stipulations? If they do some checks for like we agree to not communicate about certain types of data for this period. We miss it in year one. It starts now and then they just do some checks along the way and it's

Speaker 1 ([16:35](#)):

So to go in that direction we were to that some sort of independent evaluator to make sure, I think I want to come back to you and say where is the value? Is this an arbitrary thing of the three it's getting in the way? And that's kind of my thought. My God, there's never is the only way to get an evidence based practice is by accident and through not. Why wouldn't the few of us who have the capacity to do high quality bias research, I wouldn't. We coordinate and intentionally push the field forward. Why does it have to be an accident? But one thing that came up that Maggie brought up was the shorthand that exists amongst collaborators who make one decision with seven assumptions behind it and then that it gets in the way of replication. So maybe just speaking the unspoken is part of independence. Just making sure that every decision making rule is clearly articulated and that you document why you did when you did it and paper trail that gets you well from set of different choices that show up I talking to. But the question is I just want to get to the substance of she's gone now, but where's the value here and how do we get

Speaker 5 ([18:10](#)):

The value part? You mentioned the word bias air's bias likely to come in. Is it the independent variable or is it the dependent variable? It is like what is the value having this?

Speaker 4 ([18:26](#)):

I see the value. They're saying that if there's, let's just say a consulting group who is working with three sites on that data and all of their beautiful and then a website that is never contact, that consulting group is probably decision decisions that have been a critical feature of that iiv, the iiv that maybe the public doesn't have access to and that's

Speaker 5 ([18:53](#)):

Why.

Speaker 4 ([18:54](#)):

So I agree with you. I think there was really, really clear description, the decision making processes think or not that would give me a lot of confidence that somebody independent could get even if that wasn't done,

Speaker 2 ([19:08](#)):

Which goes back to open science and how do we get all these protocol decision making protocols,

Speaker 4 ([19:18](#)):

Structured reports aside from a pre registry and aside from the publication with all that detail about your conceptual logic model, the decisions made about your interventions, the adaptations you made along the way, if they weren't a priority, all of that fit in the publication might fit registry. That definitely doesn't really fit that, but a structured report kind of format would fit that. Clinical trials, we not have a structured protocol. These are the things you have to report and a lot of it is about decision. Those kind of algorithms that are

Speaker 1 ([19:58](#)):

Is there, would there be value if we generated a structure code, we decided juncture intervention, here's my framework for decision making and here are my considerations. Option E amongst A through F at this stage. Is that enough or is there also some value in then allowing somebody else to when they hear the narrative report, what can happened when it happens? Is there an IOA element to judgment, your rule of precise that you should have come to this? I don't know. That's so fucking precise. There's probably seven different right hands choice of making decisions, but is it enough to just report what you did or it is the decision making frame.

Speaker 4 ([21:00](#)):

Personally, I just stop recording all that information. The group came back from communication. If it's more about methodological equality, then question in terms of like, hey, right decision, methodological, right Design conversation. Let's,

Speaker 5 ([21:30](#)):

I'm worried that you're the reason that we do interdisciplinary research. And even more so than that, the idea of combining intervention development with implementation development and getting outside sources beyond just the investigators involved in those decisions that go into how do you not only create effective treatment, but one that's practical and easy to implement. And those things haven't gone together traditionally, but they need to. And you're sort of destroying the logic behind. You have this opportunity to collaborate not only across wonderful investigators, but geographically across a bunch of practitioners with lots of different kinds of students and what have you. Like it's that three part of this that really pan me

Speaker 1 ([22:37](#)):

In some ways. We are trying to homogenize the decision making. The point of this grant, a grant in some ways is clinical judgment. So instead of accidentally producing practitioners that can do that could cash the checks that are profession kept rights, we're going to be effective interventionists. We're trying to figure out what victim information people, they're going to make the certain decisions that we say are the right decisions and then we're going to evaluate the extent to which those decisions need. So in some ways it's the point, and maybe it's in some ways it's like it is too early to try and homogenize clinical decision making. So we're going to fail miserably because we don't even

Speaker 2 ([23:27](#)):

A different phase of development

Speaker 1 ([23:28](#)):

Still

Speaker 2 ([23:29](#)):

Ironing all that out right before we can replicate.

Speaker 5 ([23:33](#)):

So you're trying to develop something that isn't going to have a very standardized protocol that people just follow the recipe, they're going to be clinical decision makers, right? Is that what you're saying?

Speaker 1 ([23:47](#)):

You're doing acquisitions. So we're trying to create a for the secret thing to competency, but a different approach. That's another problem independently.

Speaker 7 ([24:23](#)):

I like the idea, sorry. I came in late, I was doing the study. I like the idea of documenting, like Wendy was saying, what questions came up and how decisions were made for the transparency purpose, but also those are interesting data, descriptive data in and of themselves about what kinds of questions came up and what was the process for addressing those and does that even maybe help inform your intervention further by what are the things people struggle with and how do we build in more scaffolding or whatever for the people who are using it so that they can do that independently or we see how people inform their decisions so that when a new question comes up, it doesn't fit any of that other stuff. There's something there that I can maybe go, oh, well here's how they approach that. That can help guide me how to approach it,

Speaker 2 ([25:22](#)):

Which reminds me of Anne's talk just this last session, right around adaptation and how do we document those decisions around it?

Speaker 4 ([25:33](#)):

Sure. Really quickly and say, what difference would it make if you across three groups with six participants at each or 20 participants total? If your group across three sites without independence replicate gave me a hundred replications, would I be happy with that? So I guess that's where it's kind of a, do we need, I mean it is 3 5 20 as arbitrary in some ways. We dropped an analysis like, Hey, we're not

worried about that anymore. Let's just do meta analysis. But if your group were to produce enough replications for us to feel really confident that you got the effect you got, and then maybe one other group replicated it, who cares? So what are we getting that, are we really getting that replication or is it about independence? We care a lot about it or more about,

Speaker 2 ([26:24](#)):

Well, I think we care about BO because if you have one team, how we defines our group who's replicating a hundred times, and then you have another team who's unaffiliated, truly independent, who cannot replicate, which is what you were talking about, which we've seen particularly in the field of functional analysis, that becomes problematic. And so is it an evidence-based practice? If it really is only for folks who have gone through that training and have this intuitive understanding or learned understanding about how to make these adaptations and decisions,

Speaker 1 ([27:04](#)):

You have to let me go.

Speaker 2 ([27:10](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 7 ([27:11](#)):

Make sure that you signed in if you haven't already,

Speaker 2 ([27:16](#)):

That's going to move it to stay there and do it again.