Follow-up Evaluation

Introduction

The Partnership for People with Disabilities conducted a follow-up evaluation of the *Kaleidoscope: New Perspectives in Service Coordination*, *Level I* training. The first training was held in Fredericksburg, Virginia, on June 23 and 24, 2003 and July, 23, 2003. The second training was held in Bristol, Virginia, on September 24 and 25, 2003 and October 22, 2003. The follow-up survey for these two trainings was emailed to participants on December 9, 2003 and a reminder survey was sent again on December 16, 2003. The third training was held in Charlottesville, Virginia, on March 10 and 11, 2004 and March 31, 2004. The follow-up survey was emailed to participants about two months later on June 22, 2004 and a reminder survey was sent on June 28, 2004.

Instrument

One email survey instrument was used to evaluate the usefulness of the training. Besides demographic information, participants were asked three additional questions:
1) Had participants referred back to the training manual since completing the training, and if so, which aspects of the manual did they find useful?
2) Had participants been able to apply what they learned to situations they encountered in the field? Or, had there been times when they thought back to the training?
3) Had participants shared any of the information or materials they received from the training with supervisors or colleagues?

Participant Demographics

A total of forty-four participants (18 from Fredericksburg, 6 from Bristol, and 20 from Charlottesville) provided their email address and were sent a follow-up email survey. Nineteen of the forty-four participants responded (2 from Bristol, 6 from Fredericksburg, and 11 from Charlottesville). It should be noted that some addresses were not valid and had delivery problems that could not be corrected. The majority of participants who responded were Dedicated E.I. Service Coordinators (n=7, 37%). Equal numbers were Case Managers Across Disciplines (n=3, 16%), SPO Case Managers (n=3, 16%), Primary Case Managers (n=3, 16%), and "Other" (n=3, 16%). The majority of participants

reported to be working full time (n=16, 84%). The majority of participants worked in either a rural (n=8, 42%) or urban (n=8, 42%) community. This was followed by 16% (n=3) who worked in a suburban community.

Results

Training Manual Sixty-three percent (n=12) of respondents indicated that they had referred back to the training manual since completing the training. The following sections of the manual were reported to be the most useful:

- IFSP process: goal writing and implementation
- Intake: assessment, policy to determine eligibility, and financial information
- Highest standard qualification
- Resources
- Transition
- State definition of developmental delay
- IEP
- Ability to pay
- Service provider guidelines
- Reviewed the philosophy to help me explain the services to new families
- Reviewed the information about routines and activities.

Application Of What Was Learned   One hundred percent (n=19) of respondents indicated that they applied what they learned at the training to situations they encountered in the field or there had been times when they thought back to the training. The following examples were provided:

- Educating private therapy providers and new families about what my role is.
- Writing IFSP outcomes
- How to reframe questions to get more information at IFSP meetings
- To keep an open mind about what the family wants and not impose what I think the family needs.
- HV
- Recognition of cultural diversity
- To remember that prematurity is no longer considered a diagnosable condition; instead, look at possible atypical development if there is not a 25% delay.
- Assessments and home visits.
- Issues about policy were helpful.
- All therapist/providers should be trained by this curriculum.

Sharing Information With Others Eighty-four percent (n=16) of respondents reported that they had shared the information or materials that they received at

the training with their supervisor or other colleagues. The following are examples of the type of information they shared:

- Resource manual
- How to write the IFSP
- Flow sheet for procedural safeguards
- Provided supervision and guidance with other new service coordinators.
- Laws
- Value of diversity in families
- Qualifications for services
- Differences between temporary verses permanent service coordination
- Natural environments
- State definition of developmental delay
- Information about ability to pay
- Everything