

Evaluation Committee Meeting Notes

May 4, 2005

Attendees: Mardell Nelson, Sherrie Brown, Wes Engel, Alberta Dooley, Rick Phillips, Oscar Morgan and Victoria Owens.

Agenda Review:

CDIU – Virtual Data Team

Academy

Reviewed previous meetings working agenda to develop academy evaluation tool.

Academy: Alberta Dooley lead on evaluation

1. 46 new workers in attendance split into two groups.
Reviewed aggregate academy module evaluation results which indicate positive results

Tool looks at overall value, activities, learning objectives, and self.

Action: Committee worked on clarifying language of the tool and questions related to evaluation feedback form for academy. Space will be available for comments on the feedback form for participants comments.

Academy module evaluation tool will be taken to curriculum committee scheduled for the next day with recommendations for language changes.

2. Competency based learning assignments have not been returned from the Region. Participants in academy indicated that they had talked to their supervisors but the forms had not been returned. Chiefs, who had observed the academy, suggested that the assignment and intention needs to be an agenda item in the chiefs meeting.

Action: Mardell will take recommendation forward as an agenda item for the Chiefs meeting.

3. Discussion regarding the overall intent of the academy evaluation. Suggestions were for consideration of a “post only reflective pre” (for each objective ask them to reflect on their knowledge after the training and what it was before the pre).

Reflection on post helps them concentrating on a reflective pre.

Evaluation committee is making a recommendation to add in the reflective piece to the evaluation feedback.

Berta will make recommendation to the curriculum committee

There were questions regarding the structure of a post only reflective pre from the group and Rick will forward article explaining the process as well as other reference material.

Structure for Evaluation Framework – Rick led discussion

Purpose – there were four reasons for an evaluation listed in the document. *see attached Document for changes suggested in the committee.

Added one more category to purpose – empowerment.

Social policy is a sub- category of accountability.

Read as Accountability: related to funding goals and social policy development.

Who is going to benefit? Audience? Participatory evaluation and the audience benefits from the evaluation.

Maintain in document how participants are going to benefit in this process.

Assurances speak to how the evaluator will carry out the evaluation so it meets these standards.

IE: Pride wants to do an evaluation. This structure allows the committee to review the proposal and provide feedback to the proposal.

Questions: Will all evaluations carry with them a participatory expectation? Response was an agreement based on the needs of the Department and fits with their Strategic Plan – Goal #2.

It does begin to build in a human subjects review – quality assurance and raising the expectation through training.

Audience

How we help people who are learning to design evaluation. Reason for the division of evaluation process and results.

List the audiences:

Program participants

Staff

Decision-makers

Administrative- internal

Policy makers

External stakeholders --- lines for evaluator to explain

Providers – specify

Assurances:

Key audience rather than “participants” Describe the means by which staff and key audience will be involved

#2 – represents the participatory model - change to evaluation process rather than design.

One assurance is that the final design has to be approved by this committee.

#3 gets to issue of the product/report

#4 needs to be field tested – doesn’t need to be a big deal but has to have some run through. This provides a learning opportunity.

#5 If evaluation is important then we need to have the budget/resources to support it.

What budget and other resources and access to data are needed to support this proposal.

#6 sustainability – of the program – If the evaluation process goes beyond the funding year, how will the evaluation be embedded....

Would there need to be anything on training for staff or data collectors?

Section on attachments:

- Budget

- Instruments for evaluation purposes

- IRB if applicable

- Project proposal

Action: Patty will take suggestions and re-send as draft. Final document will be in place by next meeting.

Pride Evaluation Discussion

Conference call to Brian Christiansen and Kim Fordham

Two proposals submitted:

- One proposal is for completion of Brian's Phd program

- One is a proposal for exit information for the Pride program.

Pride Post-Post Research Proposal – Phd program

Take pride participants and follow up one year post. Using same 20 questions with participants who already went through Pride.

Brian described: IRB approval, mail consent with the 20 questions, along with some retention questions – are they still foster parents. Open ended questions included so that they are able to tell their story.

- What are the retention variables

- Collect data and compile it

- Have they retained their learning and second retention piece is whether they are still foster parents.

First 20 questions are related to the training and the training content. That survey may not serve the need of gathering relevant information one year out. The first 20 questions is specific to training content and, it was suggested, might be more helpful to look at training concepts. Recommendation from the evaluation is a “post-only pre.” This design would allow the department to look at retention of concepts rather than language.

Action: Rick offered to work with Brian on developing a survey instrument that could be transferable to other projects. Rick will email instruments and literature.

Recommendation is to use another instrument in this survey or tool.

The evaluation template will be sent to Brian for completion and review at the next meeting.

Offers opportunity to bring students along in their research projects.

Exit Interview Proposal

Why do foster parents leave the system?

Movement to a more standardized process of assessment

Exit interview has not been addressed but a committee was formed and to began to look @ what other states were doing. Brian pulled together a draft of their findings.

There is currently nothing state-wide and no way of tracking exit information.

A foster parent satisfaction survey? Is this what we want? What is it that this proposal is trying to accomplish? Do we want this information only when they leave?

Recommendations have been put forward and have some examples of tools used by Casey or other states. Would this be standardized? Who would be administering the tool? Who will be doing this?

Boise State faculty also wants to do an exit interview and have some funding for completing an exit interview.

Action: *Needs to be on the agenda for the Resource Family committee and reviewed for moving this forward. One time study to fulfill some information needs and use what we learn from this to create a process for sustainability.*

Need to have the Program Managers involvement in the exit interview process.

Need to have the Advisory Committee complete the template

If fits within the CQI process around foster parent retention. Have the study inform the Pride Curriculum and support to foster parents in the field.

Family resource specialist – would this study be used to help them

This kind of evaluation would help us better learn how you look at the front end of recruitment.

Plan was developed for this proposal to go back to committee.

Family Decision-Making

The evaluation of family centered meeting came with the curriculum

Tool will be forwarded to Ed Bynes for his review.

The design of the evaluation will be completed by Ed

Will forward for Evaluation Framework to Ed

Updates on CDIU and virtual data unit

Meet once a week.

Look at how information across the department is shared

Assessment of service integration in Region 2. Is it quicker and faster than under the old system.

They are reviewing the cost per client for multiple services.

Division of Welfare – looking at ways to forecast – what are the trends for food stamps.

Will help in managing and utilization of resources. Forecasting for CMH and cp.

Ie: Are child protection cases increasing?

Impact to Medicaid program – forecasting for Baby Boomers?

How substance abuse impacts multiple programs? TANF, CP and Medicaid.

Family & Community Services do not have one person dedicated to analyzing the data.

Agenda item for next meeting:

Academy training – second round of academy tentatively scheduled to begin June 20th.

Formative for this year and use this time to figure out the real evaluation.

Tabling the proposal for fgdm until next meeting.

Review the evaluation framework with changes.

Charter

Tabled and have as an agenda item for finalization next meeting. Finalize by June 1st.

Conference call for Evaluation Committee set for June 28th @ 9am mountain time.