



## **Introduction**

The Partnership for People with Disabilities offered the New Perspectives in Service Coordination - Level 1 Training to case managers and service coordinators. The training was held on 3 days, March 30, 31, and May 19, 2006, in Culpeper, VA. There were fourteen people in attendance. This report will cover the evaluation for days 1 and 2 of the training.

## **Instrument**

One instrument was used to evaluate participants' satisfaction with the training after attending days 1 and 2. Besides demographic information, participants were asked to rate their satisfaction with the training, the knowledge of the presenters, usefulness of training content, and organization of the content and materials. Using three open-ended questions, participants were also asked to write what they found most useable or relevant from the training, what they wish they would have received from the training, and their overall comments about the training.

## **Participant Demographics**

Thirteen participants completed the evaluation form at the end of day 2. The participants included Dedicated E.I. Service Coordinators (n=6, 43%), Service Coordinators with dual roles (n=4, 29%), Targeted Case Managers (TCM) (n=2, 14%) and "Other" (n=1, 8%). The "other" category consisted of a participant with the title of Interim Model.

## **Satisfaction with Training**

A review of table 1 shows that the majority of participants were satisfied with the training. Almost all of the participants rated higher than the average (either five or four) in satisfaction with knowledge and preparation of the trainers, the usefulness and applicability of the content to their job, and the organization of the content and materials.

**Table 1. Satisfaction with Training N = 14**

Questions	High 5	4	3	2	Low 1	Mean
Overall rating of the training	9 (64%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)			4.6
The trainers were knowledgeable and prepared	12 (86%)	2 (14%)				4.9
The content was useful and applicable to my job	12 (86%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)			4.8
Content and materials were well organized	13 (93%)	1 (7%)				4.9

### **Usefulness and Relevancy**

One open-ended question asked participants what they found most useful or relevant about the training. The participants frequently noted IFSP discussion and outcomes training were most useful. A few participants also reported that they enjoyed the networking opportunities with other service coordinators. A summary of these comments are listed below:

- The opportunity to talk with other SCs
- Information on the roles and responsibility of SCs
- Exposure to the policies regarding EI
- IFSP discussion and activity
- Training on outcomes and goal writing
- Binders, materials related to outcomes, take-home manuals
- Small group activities, brain storming

### **Limitations and Insufficiency**

One open-ended question asked participants what they wish they would have received from the training. While many participants expressed their satisfaction with the training and commented, "I believe that I received everything that I need," some participants provided specific suggestions for future training. A summary of these comments are listed below:

- IFSP page by page writing
- More time on IFSP
- More time on outcomes
- More information regarding transition planning

## Overall Comments about the Training

One open-ended question asked participants for overall comments about the training. All of the comments were very positive. Participants reported that the training was “very helpful” and “excellent.”

The following are examples of some of the participants’ statements:

- “I feel I was given a lot of information which I feel was very helpful.”
- “Good activities to make the point.”
- “Regardless of experience level, SCs benefit greatly from this training.”
- “This training was awesome. I am more clear about my role as a service coordinator. I have more understanding on how to ask better questions for the IFSP (page 2).”



## **Introduction**

The Partnership for People with Disabilities offered the New Perspectives in Service Coordination - Level 1 Training to case managers and service coordinators. The training was held on 3 days, March 30, 31, and May 19, 2006, in Culpeper, VA. Fourteen service coordinators attended the training. This report will cover the evaluation for day 3 of the training.

## **Instrument**

One instrument was used to evaluate participants' satisfaction with the training after attending day 3. Besides demographic information, participants were asked to rate their satisfaction with the training, the knowledge of the presenters, usefulness of training content, and if the content covered the pre and post test questions. Using four open-ended questions, participants were also asked to write what they found most useable or relevant from the training, what they wish they would have received from the training, how they would be making changes to their practice as a result of the training, and their overall comments about the training.

## **Participant Demographics**

Eleven participants completed the evaluation form at the end of the training. The participants included Dedicated E.I. Service Coordinators (n=5, 38%), Service Coordinators with dual roles (n=5, 38%), and Targeted Case Managers (TCM) (n=1, 8%).

## **Satisfaction with Training**

A review of table 1 shows that the majority of participants were satisfied with the training. All of the participants gave a rating of either five or four in satisfaction with knowledge and preparation of the trainers, and the usefulness and applicability of the content to their job. In addition, participants rated higher than the average indicated that the pre and post-test questions were sufficiently covered in the content of the training.

**Table 1. Satisfaction with Training N = 13**

Questions	High 5	4	3	2	Low 1	Mean
Overall rating of the training	8 (62%)	4 (31%)	1 (8%)			4.5
The trainers were knowledgeable and prepared	10 (77%)	3 (23%)				4.8
The content was useful and applicable to my job	10 (77%)	3 (23%)				4.8
The pre and post test questions were sufficiently covered in the content of the training	8 (62%)	3 (23%)				4.9

Averages may not total 100% due to missing data.

### **Usefulness and Relevancy**

One open-ended question asked participants what they found most useful or relevant about the training. The vast majority of participants noted IFSP implementation as most useful. Several participants also reported that they found the manuals were very helpful and useful. A summary of these comments are listed below:

- Development, implementation, and review of the IFSP process
- Handouts and manuals
- Meeting other SCs and listening to their ideas and stories
- Cultural competence information
- Information/clarification about service coordination
- Information on regulations and rules

### **Limitations and Insufficiency**

One open-ended question asked participants what they wish they would have received from the training. Most participants did not answer this question. One participant wrote, "I believe that I received everything that I need."

### **Change in Practice**

Participants were asked to comment about their plans to make changes in their practice as a result of the training. Participants most frequently commented that they would change their practice to have a better relationship with families and provide more family-focused services. A summary of these comments are listed below:

- Write better, measurable, individual specific goals based on priorities and concerns of the family
- Communicate better with family
- Implement more questions within the intake
- Better document SC activities on page 5
- Advocate own role as a SC with team
- Improve the frequency of service coordination

### **Overall Comments about the Training**

One open-ended question asked participants for overall comments of the training. The vast majority of comments were very positive. Participants reported that the training was “very good,” “very helpful,” “very beneficial,” and “great.” One participant wrote that she thought day 3 should be taught on day 1. The following are examples of some of the participants’ statements:

- “It was great. Learned a lot.”
- “The training was excellent. Thanks so much for not being judgmental at our mistakes, but guiding us to making positive changes.”
- “I learned even more about my role as a service coordinator. I believe I need to improve facilitating evaluations.”
- “Very good info. All providers should attend.”