

Working Session Evaluations: Raising “Managing for Results” Skills to the 4th Generation
From June 1st through June 9th, 2004 Performance Vistas (Ashley and Doug) conducted three two-day working sessions for victim services agency administrators in Tennessee, under the auspices of OCJP. This summary captures the participant evaluations for those three sessions.

1. I have a better understanding of how to use outcome data to improve my program.

Nashville: June 1 – 2, 2004 31 responses Score: 83.9% Favorability Rating: 90.3%	Jackson: June 3 – 4, 2004 14 responses Score: 92.9% Favorability Rating: 100%	Knoxville: June 8-9, 2004 27 responses Score: 94.5% Favorability Rating: 100%
Strongly Agree - 9 (29%)	Strongly Agree - 9 (64%)	Strongly Agree - 20 (74%)
Agree - 19 (61%)	Agree - 5 (36%)	Agree - 7 (26%)
Neutral - 3 (10%)	Neutral - 0 (0%)	Neutral - 0 (0%)
Disagree - 0 (0%)	Disagree - 0 (0%)	Disagree - 0 (0%)
Strongly Disagree- 0 (0%)	Strongly Disagree-0 (0%)	Strongly Disagree- 0 (0%)

2. I have a better understanding of how to match my data collection strategy to my program design.

Nashville: June 1 – 2, 2004 31 responses Score: 83.2% Favorability Rating: 90.3%	Jackson: June 3 – 4, 2004 14 responses Score: 92.9% Favorability Rating: 100%	Knoxville: June 8-9, 2004 27 responses Score: 92.6% Favorability Rating: 100%
Strongly Agree - 8 (26%)	Strongly Agree - 9 (64%)	Strongly Agree - 17 (63%)
Agree - 20 (65%)	Agree - 5 (36%)	Agree - 10 (37%)
Neutral - 3 (10%)	Neutral - 0 (0%)	Neutral - 0 (0%)
Disagree - 0 (0%)	Disagree - 0 (0%)	Disagree - 0 (0%)
Strongly Disagree- 0 (0%)	Strongly Disagree- 0 (0%)	Strongly Disagree- 0 (0%)

3. I have a plan to take this information back to my program and implement it.

Nashville: June 1 – 2, 2004 31 responses Score: 92.9% Favorability Rating: 96.8%	Jackson: June 3 – 4, 2004 14 responses Score: 92.9% Favorability Rating: 100%	Knoxville: June 8-9, 2004 27 responses Score: 94.1% Favorability Rating: 100%
Strongly Agree - 21 (68%)	Strongly Agree - 9 (64%)	Strongly Agree - 19 (70%)
Agree - 9 (29%)	Agree - 5 (36%)	Agree - 8 (30%)
Neutral - 1 (3%)	Neutral - 0 (0%)	Neutral - 0 (0%)
Disagree - 0 (0%)	Disagree - 0 (0%)	Disagree - 0 (0%)
Strongly Disagree- 0 (0%)	Strongly Disagree-0 (0%)	Strongly Disagree- 0 (0%)

OVERALL SCORES FOR ALL THREE OBJECTIVES:

Nashville: June 1 – 2, 2004 31 responses Score: 86.7% Favorability Rating: 92.5%	Jackson: June 3 – 4, 2004 14 responses Score: 92.9% Favorability Rating: 100%	Knoxville: June 8-9, 2004 27 responses Score: 93.8% Favorability Rating: 100%
Strongly Agree - 38 (68%)	Strongly Agree - 27 (64%)	Strongly Agree - 56 (69%)
Agree - 48 (29%)	Agree - 15 (36%)	Agree - 25 (31%)
Neutral - 7 (3%)	Neutral - 0 (0%)	Neutral - 0 (0%)
Disagree - 0 (0%)	Disagree - 0 (0%)	Disagree - 0 (0%)
Strongly Disagree- 0 (0%)	Strongly Disagree- 0 (0%)	Strongly Disagree- 0 (0%)

COMMENTS ABOUT WHAT WAS MOST USEFUL ABOUT THE TRAINING:**Nashville:***How to collect and/or use data*

- Better understanding of how our outcome data can enhance/improve our program
- How to use data collection – results – in my program
- Information that brings my program into the 4th generation (I feel sometimes we are still in the 2nd)
- Discussion about 4th generation ideas
- Hearing from 3 individuals who are doing creative things
- Realizing I need to use data not only to improve program, but also be more forthcoming in sharing stats with other staff, supervisors, whoever will listen!
- What actions to take to ensure the reliability of observed outcomes
- Clarification of satisfaction vs. outcome
- Clarification about what we can/cannot do to our surveys
- Data collection discussions
- Dividing questionnaires up and giving small pieces at a time
- Use of drop box with one to one surveys

How to report data

- That we can send data to OCJP that we collect that is not “core” requirements of grant, but that shows the strength/validity of the program
- Learning that supplemental data can be used
- Recommendations for how to write a good case scenario and with whom to share it with

Evaluation process

- Following logic model plan
- Time set aside to reflect and get a plan for updating the evaluation process
- Putting ideas on flow chart, giving everyone a chance to relate their program’s purpose
- Client satisfaction surveys are not research based – can define how to collect the most relevant data to our program.

Survey response rates

- Information on how to improve survey response rates
- Survey return
- Ashley clear with her information and responses

Group interaction/networking

- Working in groups is great to hear ways that other programs implement surveys and data collection.
- Simply having the opportunity to speak with others who have similar programs and realizing they are running into similar issues with the clients
- Helpful to be in a room with other OCJP agencies in my [program] area to discuss effective ways to implement these ideas in my agency and get new ideas
- Meeting in small group with similar agencies so that we can discuss and compare
- Networking. I learned more about other programs work and how they measure it. I heard that many programs are doing a great job of moving through the process and making programmatic improvements and that was encouraging.
- Networking with others

- Networking with other agencies like my agency
- Being at a table with “similar” programs
- Being at table with programs like mine
- The interaction of the group and the exchange of ideas.
- Group interaction/ideas
- Small groups
- Small groups
- I found I’m not alone in some of the areas I was unclear on. This was very helpful. Thank you.

Miscellaneous

- Communication of what’s expected
- Idea that if program is doing what it said it would – the surveys and outcomes come naturally
- The importance of more than one survey per client
- I need to change from one area of core outcomes to another area
- I thought a lot about how little my staff could discuss about outcome measures, especially staff hired this past year

Session Format/Location

- Having the idea boards to hear other people’s ideas and feedback
- Posting of ideas from other agencies
- Seeing all the ideas in writing
- Good mixture of presenting and participant participation
- Selection of training location (TBI very accessible)
- Having grant monitors available
- I appreciated Doug’s ability to recognize when to call it a day!

Jackson:

How to collect and/or use data

- Discussion about splitting survey questions over time. This helped me think beyond surveying re: all questions at case closure
- Asking appropriate questions after appropriate tasks are completed by client
- Peer discussion of strategies for tailoring outcome data collection
- Learned a client doesn’t have to answer all questions
- Telling clients up front about the survey
- Surveys don’t have to be anonymous
- How to properly use my outcome info and how OVC looks at the info I send to them

How to report data

- Better understanding of reporting requirements in the past. I have always given the information asked. I have since learned that you [can] never give too much information.

Survey response rates

- Points made by Ashley about surveys

Group interaction/networking

- Networking
- The group setting and being able to hear from other managers

- Collaboration and brainstorming with others
- Sharing approaches and information with other projects
- Opportunity to hear other service providers share their challenges and successes

Session Format/Location

- Information from 4 program leaders on how they used outcome data
- Better to have group together than small groups
- Large and small group discussion
- Consultation with Ashley

Knoxville:

How to collect and/or use data

- Tools to refine my program design to match with my outcome measurements
- Understanding of logic model connection to data collection
- Better understating of why we use data outcome.
- Knowledge of flexibility in administering surveys/collecting data
- Knowing how to implement changes - breaking down surveys
- Separating survey questions and their distribution timing
- Break down of client survey
- Breaking down the data into sections
- Breaking apart questions to be asked at most appropriate times
- Survey breakdowns
- Separate survey
- Ideas for collecting data over time
- Data collection methods
- Creating ideas to obtain more accurate data
- Creative ideas for surveys
- New concept for survey
- Board development ideas
- Board training my Logic Model
- How to cause board to become vested in our logic model/outcomes
- Putting questions up on board

Group interaction/networking

- Peer ideas of what is already working! Ex: break down survey questions
- Ideas from peers that generated some brainstorming ideas for me – i.e. survey breakdowns
- Hearing how other agencies are collecting and utilizing their data
- Bouncing ideas off other people. Trainers are very open to ideas and help to make our ideas useable and concrete
- Interpersonal dialogue of group
- Discussion with other programs
- Collective ideas (creativity to take back)

Session Format

- Gathered greatly needed feedback.
- Teamwork from PVI staff and OCJP in providing immediate response & feedback on specific questions

- Bring the OM of program to staff. Lots of great ideas. Plan to implement.

COMMENTS ABOUT WHAT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT IN THIS TRAINING:

Nashville:

Stated content of workshop

- Clarification of goals of workshop at beginning
- Be clear about “supplemental” data versus “core & required” data
- Some what confused by observers notes on outcomes, reliability of observed outcomes, etc.
- Consider all programs versus DV emphasis

Suggested content of workshop

- Connect this training with OCJP updates/revisions
- Would have been helpful to incorporate recently mailed data into this training

Facilitation of Session

- Less “conversation” and more concrete
- When people ask for concrete examples vague responses are sometimes given, which leads to confusion and frustration. Maybe have some generic examples so that people can get a frame of reference.
- Answers to questions often went in circles and failed to clarify things
- Questions answered with questions, diverting OCJP communication responsibilities
- Need to make the point (whatever that may be) and move on – alot of time spent repeating some thing, statement, idea
- Streamline comments and explanations – could do this in one day
- Discussion to a limit
- A lot of the agency specific comments need to be directed to monitor. They create confusion for other agencies
- A way to minimize participants dominating the discussion and taking away from the agenda
- Spent too much time on questions
- Staying on task
- Stay on track
- I thought we got side tracked.

Timing

- Have in March or April...allowing for implementation time

Jackson:

Facilitation of Session

- Keep agency facilitators on task in their presentations
- Spent over an hour yesterday beating a dead horse about survey and we are all different so nothing was accomplished
- Training was great! One thing to add would be more involvement by OCJP staff. While they said that outcomes don't impact funding negatively, the reality is that we all depend on OCJP for funding and we report to them. It would be helpful for OCJP staff to say more about what they do with reports, etc.

Session Format

- Need more time for small group activities and discussion
- Get in group with your grant manager to talk and ask specific questions

- Get in small group with similar agencies and brainstorm
- Plan for 1 day of training when possible rather than 1 ½ days
- One day training
- 1 day would have been better than 1 ½ days. Might have organized the lunch break to be an issue luncheon to tackle one of the topics on the agenda.

Miscellaneous

- Make VHS tapes to give to each program.
- Need more state sponsored skills training. This would improve collection and application of data from everyone.

Other

- Great job!! You guys are the best!
- No improvement. Excellent workshop. Thanks for your time and efforts.
- Nothing I can think of

Knoxville:

Content

- (How to do) Surveying at (community) presentations

Facilitation of Session

- More small group interaction – especially within disciplines
- Group people together with common programs
- More discussion with similar programs
- Sometimes think could have allowed more interaction from group
- Sometimes think could be said more to the point
- Clear answers/less ambiguity
- Better detail on questions asked

Documentation/Handouts

- Would be helpful to have some of card ideas either posted on website or sent back out.
- More examples of forms, surveys, collection instruments, tracking documents, etc.

Session Format

- More time/more often
- Session could last 2 complete days to allow time for more interaction and exchange or information/ideas
- I would prefer a 1 day training – it is a lot of information, but staying over night or choosing to drive back and forth is difficult
- Break down into sections at first so all DV come to one training, STOP to another, etc.
- More breaks

Facility

- Larger room so we could bring at least one other person to hear these ideas and help implement plans at our program(s)
- Would like to have enough space to bring more key staff
- More room for classes (crowded)
- Room set up could be better
- Larger facility seating & cooler environment (not facilitator's fault)

- Logistical, environmental issues – heat, lights, doors open, space

Miscellaneous

- Administrative: Lack of introductions of speaker and other who did not have name tents; presenter who did not have handouts (copier's broken – indicates last minute preparation); schedule 8 am start without checking building opening time
- Presenters to wear name tags with name in big letters and introduction of all involved persons and their roles

Other

- Always very good pertinent training
- Good job! Really got us thinking
- Good job!
- I'm too new and too needy to know what might not have been on target. Thanks for a job WELL DONE!!
- Felt training was best one yet. Motivated and I look forward to implementing ideas presented.
- Thanks, had a great time and learned much!