



# KALEIDOSCOPE

New Perspectives in  
Service Coordination  
LEVEL I

## Introduction

The Partnership for People with Disabilities offered the *New Perspectives in Service Coordination - Level 1 Training* to service coordinators. The training was held on January 24, 25, and February 27, 2006 in Roanoke, VA. Thirty-three individuals attended the training. This evaluation report will cover the evaluation of the training conducted at that time.

## Instrument

One instrument was used to evaluate participants' satisfaction with the training. Besides demographic information, participants were asked about their overall satisfaction with the training, the knowledge of the presenters, pre and mid training activities, usefulness of training content, and if the content covered the pre and post test questions. The participants were also asked to list the most useful and least useful training activities, and to discuss how they would make changes to their practice as a result of the training.

## Participant Demographics

Thirty-two participants completed the evaluation form on the last day of training. The participants included Dedicated E.I. Service Coordinators (n=8, 25%). Service Coordinators with dual roles (n=9, 28%), Targeted Case Managers (TCM) (n=6, 19%) and "Other" (n=7, 22%). The "other" category consisted of participants with the following titles: Special Educator, System Manager, Special Instructor, and Service Coordinator.

## Satisfaction with Training

A review of table 1 (below) indicates that more than half of participants either "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the pre-training activities were helpful. The majority of participants either "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the trainers were knowledgeable and prepared and that the content was useful. Pre and post- test questions were well received with almost all of the participants responding "strongly

agreed” or “agreed” that the questions were sufficiently covered in the content of the training.

**Table 1. Satisfaction with Training N=32**

Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The pre and mid training activities were helpful.	n= 2 (6%)	n= 17 (53%)	n= 7 (22%)	n=3 (9%)
The trainers were knowledgeable and prepared.	n=14(44%)	n=17 (53%)	n= 0 (0%)	n=1 (3%)
The content was useful.	n= 11 (34%)	n= 17 (53%)	n= 1 (3%)	n=3 (9%)
The pre and post-test questions were sufficiently covered in the content of the training.	n= 6 (19%)	n= 18 (56%)	n= 0 (0%)	n=1 (3%)

Averages may not total 100% due to missing data.

### Training Activities

Participants were asked to comment on what was most and least useful about the pre-training activities. A summary of these comments are listed below:

#### Most useful activities:

- Development, implementation, and review of the IFSP process
- Long and short term goals writing practice
- The resource guide and training manual
- ATP scenario
- Hands on activities
- Outcome development and discussion
- Hearing about other agencies and how they handle situations
- Learning about laws, rules, and regulations

#### Least useful activities:

- The hat activity
- Game type activities
- Cultural information
- Overview of broader topics
- IFSP development

## Changes in Practice

Participants were asked to comment about their plans to make changes in their practice as a result of the training. Their comments were summarized and are listed below:

- Improve IFSP goal and outcomes writing: Write more specific, individualistic, measurable, functional, and family-friendly outcomes
- Better communication with families and get better information on their priorities, concerns, resources, and routines
- Increase use of resource manual
- Share training materials and information with co-workers
- Help providers to understand the importance of functional goals
- Have another training in outcome writing

## Overall Comments about the Training

One open-ended question asked participants for overall comments on the training. The responses of the participants were mixed. While some participants reported that the training was “very helpful” and “excellent,” others commented on the issues with time management and a lack of specific answers to their questions. Some participants stated that the content was too basic for service coordinators who have been in the position for years. They suggested having separate trainings for new and seasoned SCs. The following are examples of some of the participants’ statements:

### Positives

- “Enjoyed presenters and getting feedback from attendants!”
- “The instructors were knowledgeable and informative.”
- “Very insightful! I feel less confused!”
- “Great facilities and food. Presenters made training very comfortable and helped the group feel comfortable answering/asking questions.”

### Negatives/Suggestions

- “Should include more in-depth training on consulting techniques.”
- “I would have benefited more from more training about detailed info about actually filing out the IFSP and when and how to have consents done. Seems like it was just more of an overview and I needed details. It also should have been 3 days together- not broken up in 2 and 1 days.”

- Did not feel homework was necessary or beneficial.
- I'd love to spend more time going through IFSP technicalities... as it is the cornerstone of Part C. More strategies to deal with daily issues. Mental health and Part C children."