Evaluation Board Agenda
November 6, 2008 ~~ 8:30am – 2:00pm
Central Office, PTC Building ~ 9th Floor Conference Room

Partnership Goals:

#1 ~ Improve retention of Workforce and Resource Families
#2 ~ Improve Recruitment of Workforce and Resource Families
#3 ~ Decrease Disparate Outcomes in Child Welfare

Attendance: Mike Scholl, Patty Gregory, Kathy Tidwell, Frank Sesek, Chuck Halligan, Oscar Morgan, Alberta Dooley, Butch Rodenhiser, Rick Phillips, Mardell Nelson, Brian Baldwin, Roxanne Printz, Robert Hernandez (Notes), Andrew Yoder (Guest)

AGENDA ITEM	TIME	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
Welcome, Minutes Review	8:30	The September 2008 minutes were reviewed. The revision of minutes' format will be done with the new format approved by the Operations Board. The Agenda was then reviewed.		
Review Work / Communication with other Partnership Boards: Participatory Evaluation, Student Institute Proposal Form, Evaluation and Research Frameworks		Discussion took place on how the Evaluation Board works within the Partnership and its review on what the Scholars Board is doing. **Participatory Evaluation**. Copies of the Participatory Evaluation Form were distributed. This gives the background and principles of participatory evaluation which goes from principle to action. Since the goal is to be proactive, participatory evaluation impacts decision making. The stakeholders can build their experience on concepts. If we have the discussion without the stakeholders, they are not participating and so cannot influence where the new knowledge goes. For family center practice decision are made with parents and families. When decision making involves families this includes a participatory level. **Participatory Approach and Trust.** The participatory approach has helped people become less distrustful. About ten years ago the Program Managers shut evaluation out of the work; there was a hostile approach to the evaluation process. This was when the board addressed the group from a more traditional approach. In time they were able to accomplish that. Setting PET, record review, and an evaluation process on the agenda are indications that progress has		

<u>Purpose</u>: To facilitate outcome identification, development and achievement, provide guidance and support for the implementation of service and outcome evaluation activities associated with the Partnership, and to promote and develop standardization of procedures.

been made.

Participatory Process. The process has been that a student presents a project to the field supervisor, then the program manager signs off on it and a liaison from the school helps with it. There is quite a bit of participation involved with a student project. Is it required that IV-E students be involved in a project? The answer is yes. When an Institute is just a research project it can be boring. The last Institute was great- students picked projects and they made contributions. One way the contribution was put into practice was the Icebreaker and Proceedings.

Participatory Model. There has been a cultural shift; the participatory model should be in all the boards with the help of the Evaluation Board looking at the model and helping them make decisions with this lens. The question on how will the Evaluation Board help the chairs become firmed up with this model was asked. Is the board to agree on this model and then infuse it to the other boards? Since there is a Disproportionality Plan taking place with the Operations Board, Scholars Board, and Practice Development Board, this model can begin there. It was mentioned that it seems that this conversation has been taking place for the past eight years. The projects are moving to a participatory approach and there is direction and consistency with the boards. It was asked that if this is a philosophy, then why is it being brought up. The reason is because there is no consistent form on how to engage stakeholders. DHW is moving to Phase 2 of the CSFR which will have RIPS that will engage the community and get the conversation in all directions.

Participatory Evaluation vs. Research. There is a distinction between evaluation and research. The Evaluation Board was to look at evaluation. This form is about evaluation. Within the Partnership there is need for research. This framework may provide information for the field that can see evaluation as research. This is being discussed nationally and the MOU indicates that we have joint ownership of projects and the process will go in this direction. The next draft of the MOU is being worked on to move this along. DHW never had an IRB before so when projects were done, only the university IRB was given for it. There is a big hassle regarding the student report. They now have IRB, but it is not known how much they will be involved. The DHW IRB from CQI for the foster parent

		interview includes a research committee to determine if this is evaluation or research and if they want them. They will need a consent form. If the university is doing research, they require their IRB look at it. The DHW IRB will not look at anything that looks like evaluation, but the university IRB looks at everything. It is uncertain if the university IRB needs the DHW IRB. DHW has a formal form for when they will say yes, if they determined this to be research. When having a DHW activity contracted, the university IRB was used and it involved much work to get it through. **Need Philosophy and Framework**. The Evaluation Board is to have a philosophy and framework to determine how projects are done. Reference to the Humane Society and lessons learned was given. The community wanted research and it was done in order to implement assistance to the community. The desire is not to lose this. Questions generated were: “Who approves the research?” Who makes sure that it is within the guidelines of the Partnership?” Who ensures that grants are written that way?” The need is to build into the mission statement who do the projects serve? Children and families, line workers, student faculty, Casey, etc. No matter what the project is from the board or university, the reason for this is to improve services to children and families. Keep this as the main goal and everything else comes from that. How you get there is important. The Evaluation Board charter and work plan was passed around. **Participatory Next Steps**. The following action steps will be taken: 1. The participatory research aspect will be in draft form and shared with the boards (Rick will see where research fits in). This will be emailed to Operation Board members with the offer to help the chairs. 2. Kathy will head a group for revising the Evaluation Board Charter and see if they can also update the workplan where applicable. Work will be done to make sure the value from the workplan goes into the logic model. 3. It was the board’s consensus to retire the workplan and replace it with the logic model. The workplan will be kept as a base of operation (archived for reference). **Mardell’s Announcement.** Mardell announced to the board that she has submitted her resignation to DHW and will retire effective		Participatory Research draft sent to the Board Chairs Kathy to head a workgroup to revise the Board’s Charter and Workplan Replace existing workplan with logic model

		December 31, 2008. She indicated that it is timely to what is going on with the Partnership and does want to be involved in the next stage of its development. She will try to find ways to be involved in the Partnership.		
Academy Evaluation Status and Flow Chart *Rick Phillips*		**Academy and Practice.** Data has been presented to the Program Managers. The first page is the status of where we are in relation to where the Feds would like us to be: providing evidence where the Academy has had an impact on practice. The matrix was passed around to show how the Academy process has helped with practice. There is a need for a pre-test of each academy session to show where they are. The pre-test and post-test are to be done in objective ways. It would be good to find a state model that is already doing this and emulate that model. This is moving to a competency based approached. For the self-assessment, there is the potential for self assessment around competency. **Academy Assessment.** The feedback is that this seems like social work 101. So the process of evaluation can aid in insuring that this is information they recognize they need, thus making them efficient learners. Supervisors are in this since there is observed behavior in the field. For the post-academy self-assessment, it is taking behavior related to the competencies and then assess where we are. The new worker process leads to the development plan. When, how often and how many post academy self assessments should there be? One prior to the nine month decision making. If this is organized around nine months and we learn how to intervene with the supervisors, the stage could be set in learning the development plan to see if this is on-boarding people one to two years later. There will be a nine month and twenty-four month juncture for this. **Academy Competency.** Work will be done to identify a state (CA has one). WA has gone to a competency based teacher. An interpretive model takes competency and takes personal care. All curriculum came from Ohio. The Casey competency model mirrored the performance model so we want to retrofit this. Berta helped develop a matrix to map the curriculum competency which has been given to Michelle. Templates have been given and work has been going on to get closer to the work Casey is doing. Casey has ten competencies.		

		Academy Levels. There are three basic levels of learning and the Academy process could address all three levels if we know where the participants are when they come in. For workers, six weeks of in-class seems more than they need. Some need direct instruction and some, because they are in the field, need mentoring for the competency. Some need direct instruction for practice and need two or three academy sessions- these sessions can be shorter days. Some just need basic instruction or internship. There may not need to be a class session for this, but mentoring is needed. So embedded trainers can be assigned and facilitate learning as they go on cases doing the work with their peers observing, learning and then shifting. This is going to change the role of the Supervisor and Social Worker III. The timing for this is great since the role for Social Worker III is not defined. **Academy Impact.** The second page of the handout shows how the Academy has made an impact. Earlier surveys were very dismal in the results. This is how they understand individualized CBLC and are applying what they learned in class to the field. So they are seeing this as very useful. Michelle's call to supervisors after the session has been very helpful in having this done. The training of supervisors, orientation of the CBLC and others has helped as well. The current academy group is different than prior groups. The Call to supervisors put this over the top in professional Academy behavior. This is after about two years. **Academy Workload.** Basic to professional development and retention is the ability to be able to carry a caseload, take a class and implement what was learned. They are applying what they learned in Academy when the situation presents itself. The CBLC helps reflect on practice. The Supervisors are buying off on this too. This is showing that the Academy is now in a better position than it was a year ago. From the feedback the answers were: time, court, academy, caseload, and CBLC. So the discussion areas are to address the ability to handle those cases well. The managers got together to write the caseload standards. They tried to set something and left with the understanding that seventeen is a caseload standard, but work is needed for combined screeners. The system now decided not to set the standard and the average caseload dropped from thirty-two to twenty-nine because of combining caseloads. The screeners in Academy and the Case		Rick will go to the Program Managers meeting and will get a hold of Michelle before the overall plan gets presented.

		Managers are reporting twenty. They will have a problem dealing with the caseload in defining the caseload types. Some will be doing both and some one or another. The In-take Assessment and Case Management are the types of cases. So defining this will help prevent skewed numbers in caseload listing. Of the ninety-eight responses only three themes were seen as not useful and are not applicable to actual cases. They are placing them on catch-up and focusing on these cases and not on learning. After two weeks of learning the perception of sessions has changed. Either not having enough or having too many cases affects learning. What would be the ideal number of cases for Academy is a good thing to consider. By the end of six sessions they have a feel for all the competencies. **Academy Board Role**. The role of the Academy Board is in interpreting and implementing the data. Round eight and ten confirm that the steps taken have produced favorable results. The discussion at the Academy Board would be around time and applicability. It was suggested to have the Academy Board respond to the data. **Academy Mentoring.** There is a difference in how a trainee sees the relevancy in two weeks: 1) a reflection of human nature and 2) the need for mentoring and immediate application. The need is to make mentoring a stronger component so that there is reinforcement. There is no CSFR activity relating to the supervisor. This still needs to be defined for the IV-B plan around supervisors with May 2009 as the target date. The boards are at a place where they can fit the logic model into the Operations and Admin Boards.		
Involvement in Regional Program Improvement Plans to include: Regional Permanency Composites, Chapin Hall Data Archive, Accurate Race/Ethnicity Data in FOCUS		**Report Start Date**. DHW has been negotiating the agreement with Chapin Hall and they have accepted the proposed changes. A start date is needed for the contract and would be either October 1st, 2008 or January 1st, 2009 since they prefer a quarterly system. The advantage to using the October 1st date is that there will be a two month head start. Chapin Hall may start the process as soon as they receive the data from DHW and Brian will negotiate that. The next data pull will be through Jun 2008. In February 2009 the July through Dec 2008 data would be sent. Report Data. Chapin Hall is where the FOCUS data would be sent. They align the data so that DHW can see various reports based on		Brian will see how quickly they can get the data out.

Brian Baldwin		how they want the data to be reported. They have a standardized way of reporting data. The Feds are having a demo of this as well. Everything is almost lined up. DHW has tables that line up with what they are looking for and they import the data. The turnaround should not be long- about one to two months.		
Working Lunch	11:30	**Composite Suggestions**. The composites were handed out. It was recommended that a two year competency measure be done. This was reviewed with each measure being discussed and viewed from the chart that was handed out. This can be reviewed by the Operations Board. The following were suggestions for the charts: • Have a cover page that contains a paragraph on what this is and a second paragraph defining what the graphs represent. • Replace the word "Median" with "Months" and change "County" to "Region". • If there are two or three good or bad things, these should be highlighted. • Having the charts emphasize what is good and bad. **FOCUS Accuracy**. There has been some concern on FOCUS data accuracy. What can be done by the Evaluation Board to prevent this? One area that can be improved is providing proper Native American information. The staff needs to be trained so they use appropriate questions when asking if a Native American is a member of a tribe. FOCUS will only count an ICWA child when checkmarks are in certain areas. The concern is that Native Americans who are not ICWA members are being missed and so Native American youth who are in foster care are not listed as such. It was suggested to leave it as to how people reply; have those who are members of a tribe or who are eligible. Most of the information is accurate, but most is not good enough. Maybe look at Chapin Hall and how they get information from a client. **FOCUS Training**. FOCUS training is disconnected from Academy. The training is through an Information System Coordinator. There is curriculum and video for training. Frank will be the liaison to make sure the demographics is done once the data is gathered to show how important it is for the Academy to have people know how their participation affects policy. Mike will check the Casey alliance to see how this is done on a national level.		Brian will revise the Composites with the suggested changes Frank will make sure data demographics is done. Mike will see how Casey has the data.

PRIDE Evaluation *Mardell Nelson*		**PRIDE Concern**. The concern was raised that foster parents are getting surveyed too much. This ended up with the thought of no more student evaluation on foster parents and exit surveys stopped. **PRIDE Surveying**. Frank and Mardell reviewed the minutes and they were ambiguous. So this needs to be put back on agenda, gets redirected and provide direction to the Resource Family Board. Data collection around client satisfaction was put into the PIP. There is no thought to stop the exit interview and have client satisfaction for resource families. The perception that they are getting surveyed too much is because some of this is done during the PRIDE session and then six months after the resource family gets the first child. A survey can be done to see if the PRIDE participants are getting something out of PRIDE. Continual surveying needs to be built into application process so the resource families can give assent at the onset that they will provide ongoing information. **PRIDE Evaluation**. There needs to be an evaluation of PRIDE since it is currently one size fits all. This can include evaluating the effectiveness of PRIDE and the desired outcomes. This would inform therapeutic foster care.		Brian will send request for work group members and a consent form.
CW Conference focus group output *Kathy Tidwell*		**Focus Group Report.** The Focus Group Evaluation Committee met with Andrew and worked on categorizing the answers so there were categories assigned to the answers. Andrew, a BSU Grad Assistant, helped with evaluating the focus group data and provided the board a preliminary report and handouts on the Recruitment response. The answers given for discussion will go to the Program Managers on December 9th and 10th, 2008. John and Sara are open to feeding the data that was collected. **Focus Group Distribution.** It was decided to have stakeholders involved in reviewing the answers. The focus group answers will be divided and distributed as follows: • Recruitment Responses go to the Scholars Board • Retention Responses go to the Academy Board • Disproportionality Responses go to the Practice Development Board The following members from the Evaluation Board will assist these boards with this project: • Mardell and Brian- Practice Development	It was agreed to have Andrew work for the Program Managers and the board presentations.	The focus group responses will be distributed to Scholars Board-Recruitment Academy Board-Retention Practice Development Board-Disproportion

		• Oscar- Academy • Patty- Scholars		
FGDM Update *Ed Byrnes*		**FGDM Presentation**. The report should be ready around Thanksgiving with the plan to present it to the Program Managers. This will be done at the February 2009 meeting. FGDM is all over the PIP and RIPs so this data's timing is perfect. **FGDM Priority**. Ed did some work with Jeri and he was able to set things up, but he still does not have the data. So either gathering data needs to be a priority or he needs to be allowed direct access to the data warehouse. Frank will provide Ed's target dates to Jeri and will look at case characteristics so that this can be done by the end of November 2008. Frank will speak with Jeri and get back to Ed. This has gone through EWU's IRB. **FGDM Procrastination.** It was brought up that this is the third year of a three year project and this conversation happened with FOCUS four years ago.		Frank will provide Ed's target dates to Jeri and so that this can be done by the end of November 2008. Frank will speak with Jeri and get back to Ed.
Adjourn	2:00	**Next Meeting.** Next meeting around second week of December. Brian will contact the board to get available date.		