

Evaluation Advisory Minutes

June 29, 2005

Present for conference call: Mardell Nelson, Alberta Dooley, Frank Sesek, Patty Gregory, Oscar Morgan, Rick Phillips, Sherrie Brown
Joining for the FGDM agenda item: Ed Byrnes

Agenda

#1 Review of Charter – read through:

Discussion:

Is this a FACS Division work group? Or is it partnership evaluation group?
Child Welfare evaluation group at the moment and will expand to FACS Division work group

Division is outside of the body of the Governance committee which is primarily made of the partnership. Partnership has agreed to make this entity

Frank is suggesting that this is a Division entity. This group has a Division interest in and of itself

Language of Charters will change and include outcomes and indicators.

Advisory Board Decision: This work group is dependant on others and dependant on system outcomes and charter should remain the same for now – is a good foundation to move forward.

Charter with changes to outcomes and indicators is accepted.

Action Items:

Will be presented at the Governance body on July 8th

This group has already been chartered and embedded in the EWU contract.

Mardell will re-write the charter to reflect this

Signed by Ken Diebert for finalization.

Mardell and Frank will move forward for signature and finalization

#2 Evaluation Framework

Discussion:

What is not in here that meets an IRB process?

Confidentiality

Right to leave at any time.

Human subjects protection

Add missing pieces from IRB

#7 seems like two different changes

participants involved in the plan process – part of the measurement is they set the goals that they want to achieve.

This framework only fits participatory evaluation

Assurances should be stated in declarative sections; instead of having it start with describe – change to “participants will be involved in defining outcomes”
“Evaluation will be embedded for sustainability” Descriptions of the assurances will be outlined in methodology.

Question to evaluation proposals: We are asking you to design your proposal around this. This document then turns it into an IRB.

ACTION ITEM:

1. Berta and Patty will add pieces after review of IRB from both Boise State and EWU. Rick will be included in this process.
2. Obtain Evaluation Framework as the Department IRB process and obtain approval from Division and then from Departmental level.
3. Sherry will present to the CDIU for approval after changes has been made.

**Bring it back to the next meeting for review

#3 Curriculum committee update and relationship to evaluation

Discussion:

Berta: the numbers overall look pretty good.

Changes were made for the last round of academy

Evaluation formats aren't completed yet. Look at all of the learning objectives and tie them to the evaluation.

Academy evals were sent out to all committee members. Some overlap was noted.

Nothing back yet from supervisors on learning contract

New group will find difference from the initial group with less redundancy

It was observed that the first group developed a lot of camaraderie and used this to exchange information

Berta attended all of the academy session and has taken notes. She will put them into a summary

Questions from the first round of academy:

Do the sessions hang together sequentially?

Is there redundancy across sessions?

Action Items:

Dennis will go through and measure out items that reflect only one thing

Learning objectives that were too global were reviewed and changed.

Will review how to change the way we ask the questions to a post only reflective pre.

#4 FGDM Proposal

Discussion:

Dr. Ed Byrnes joined the conference call and committee reviewed his proposal.
Contains a formative component and a summative evaluation
Would like to review system outcomes (data that is directly related to the system outcomes) pre-post?
Client outcomes – what happens to each of these families?
Research purpose – Peter Pecora has been contacted. Ray Kirk, University of North Carolina.
Trying to have results for what's happening in Idaho but also what is happening in other states. Does lend itself to a fidelity study

Ed acknowledges the need for further development which includes Department input on:

1. Objectives to work with all stakeholders on a logic model – key informant interviews – group discussion setting – key stakeholders and practitioners.
2. Developing a process data collection system – automated to record key elements of the meeting.
3. Spend time with the people who are implementing this to develop a questionnaire that fits.
4. Collecting Family Functioning Assessment Data

Goal is to generate some usable knowledge – use of FGDM

Advisory Committee Discussion:

Get clear on scope and next steps

Question in regard to scope:

How do we want to shape practice?

It is too ambitious to go for a statewide process – more in line with pilot

Building it into contract on a pilot basis.

Need a revised budget

Pilot sites? What does that mean?

Questions:

What does the Department want to learn from this? What information does the Department need from this? PIP implications?

What is the universe of clients? What would the sample be?

Action Item: Single agenda item for next evaluation committee

Next meeting to be set.