

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA



Background

- Data can be missing at the individual level or at a higher level, such as family, classroom, or program site.
- Although the impact of missing data has been studied at the individual level and statistical methods have been developed to account for it, missing data at the site level is still under-studied.
- Common best practices for reporting missing data currently do not include recommendations about reporting sitelevel missing data (e.g., Schlomer, Bauman, & Card, 2009).
- Increased knowledge of higher-level missing data is necessary to develop evaluation design and statistical methods to address it.

The Present Study

We aim to identify the prevalence of sitelevel missing data in a national dataset of programs serving at-risk families.

Data were drawn from the Children, Youth, and Families at Risk (CYFAR) Grant Program, a national initiative that provides funding to after-school programs supporting at-risk youth and their families.

Prevalence of Site-Level Missing Data in a National Evaluation of Programs for At-Risk Families

Jaime Ballard, PhD, Adeya Richmond, PhD, Suzanne van den Hoogenhof, PhD, Lynne M. Borden, PhD, & Daniel Perkins, PhD

Methods

Sample includes 1,420 adult participants from 17 programs for atrisk families. Participants were 68% female, with an average age of 35.2 (SD = 17.4). 39% were Hispanic or Latino. 52% were white, 15.92% were Black, and 7.9% were another racial minority. 19% had less than a high school education, 23% had a high school degree, and 51% had post-secondary education. Participants completed self-report measures of demographics and

individual and site level.

Results

Table 1. Prevalence of individual and site-level missing data

	Individual missing (includes site- level missing)		Percentage of missing data due to site- level	Total Percentage of Missing Data
Demographics				
Gender	66	0	0%	5%
Age	242	0	0%	17%
Ethnicity	244	0	0%	17%
Employment	124	0	0%	9%
Education	118	0	0%	8%
Race	19	0	0%	1%
Military	191	54	28%	13%
Active Duty	198	59	30%	14%
Military Branch	186	54	29%	13%
Participation				
Number Sessions	465	227	49%	33%
Hours/ week	588	227	39%	41%
Length of Participation in 4-H	538	227	42%	38%
Other Activity involvement	434	187	43%	31%
Number of other activities	1025	187	18%	72%

participation. Each item was coded as present or missing at the

- programs.

- & Moore, 2014).

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge funding provided by the United States Department of Agriculture's National Institute of Food and Agriculture (USDA-NIFA) through a cooperative agreement with the University of Minnesota and Pennsylvania State University under Grant 2018-41520-28908.

Results (continued)

• Nearly one third of all programs had sitelevel missing data, including 10 sites from 5

Site- or program-level missing data accounted for 27.53% of all missing data.

Discussion

• The high prevalence of site-level missing data we found in our study suggests an urgent need to refine statistical methods to account for site-level missing data. One strategy for minimizing site-level missing data is reducing participant and site burden associated with evaluations, either by selecting only the central variables or by using approaches such as multiform questionnaire protocols, two-method measurement models, or the wave-missing longitudinal design (Little, Jorgenson, Lang,

Researchers can invest time and support resources in generating buy-in not only at a program level, but at a site level, to ensure that all questions are administered.