Follow-up Evaluation

Introduction

The Partnership for People with Disabilities conducted a follow-up evaluation of the *Kaleidoscope: New Perspectives in Service Coordination*, *Level II* training. This training was held in Charlottesville, Virginia, on June 15 and 16, 2004. Fifteen service coordinators participated. The follow-up survey for the training was emailed to participants on December 6, 2004.

Instrument

The usefulness of the training was evaluated by the use of one survey instrument. Participants were asked to use a four-point Likert scale ("Strongly agree = 1" to "Strongly disagree =4") to rate their satisfaction with the trainers, the content and the pre-post test questions provided in the training. Additionally, participants responded to five open-ended questions that pertained to the training curriculum, as well as its applicability to their profession.

The Likert Scale Questions Included:

Strongly agree = 1, Agree = 2 Disagree = 3, Strongly Disagree = 4

1. Indicate the one participant group that best represents you.   • Dedicated E.I. Service Coordinator   • Service Coordinator with dual roles   • Targeted Case Manager (TCM)   • Other, please specify
2. The trainers were knowledgeable and prepared.
3. The content was useful and practical for my job setting.
4. The pre and post tests questions were sufficiently covered in the content of the training.

Open-ended Questions Included:

5. Will you be doing anything differently as a result of what you learned during the Kaleidoscope II training? If yes, what? If no, why not?
6. What was the most helpful portion of this training?
7. What was the least helpful portion of this training?
8. If you were to make any changes to the Kaleidoscope Level II Training, what would they be?
9. What knowledge and skills have you gained as a service coordinator as a result of participating in Kaleidoscope Level I and Level II?

Participant Demographics

Fifteen participants provided their email addresses in order to complete a follow-up email survey. Eight of those individuals responded to the emailed survey. Some email addresses were not valid and therefore could not receive a survey. The majority of respondents identified themselves as Dedicated E.I. Service Coordinators (n=5, 63%). The other groups represented in this survey were Service Coordinators with dual roles (n=2, 25%), followed by Targeted Case Managers (TCM) (n=0, 0%), and "Other" (n=1, 13%).

Results

All participants reported (n =8, 100%) that the trainers were both knowledgeable and prepared during the Kaleidoscope Level II Training. All eight participants (100%) either "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the content of the training was useful and practical to their respective job settings and that the pre and post test questions were sufficiently covered.

All of the participants reported they would change the way they provided service coordination as a result of the Kaleidoscope Level II Training. Many individuals described the change in service provision as a shift in their approach to gathering family information and writing goals. Specifically, service coordinators stated they wanted to acknowledge each team members' value and write goals to reflect family priorities. Additionally, participants identified specific skills and knowledge gained during the training that would influence their abilities as service coordinators. These included increased knowledge about policies and procedures, improved ability to write outcomes, and negotiate disagreements among team members.

Respondents indicated that the most helpful portions of the training were the topics about transition, handling difficult situations, and outcome writing. Many participants also reported they gained knowledge and support through networking and meeting other professionals to discuss real life cases. The portion in the training that seemed to be the least helpful included the topic of financial paperwork.

Several participants provided suggestions to improve the current Kaleidoscope Level II Training. These responses included the inclusion of therapy providers in training, providing a section on appropriate boundaries and offering more time for participants to interact and share ideas.