



## **Introduction**

The Partnership for People with Disabilities offered the New Perspectives in Service Coordination - Level 1 Training to nineteen case managers and service coordinators. The training was held on 3 days: October 3, 4, and November 8, 2007, in Danville, VA. There were nineteen service coordinators present. 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**

Seventeen participants completed the evaluation form on the end of day 2. The participants included Dedicated E.I. Service Coordinators (n=9, 53%), Service Coordinators with dual roles (n=3, 18%), Targeted Case Managers (TCM) (n=3, 18%) and "Other" (n=2, 12%). The "other" category consisted of participants with the titles of Intake/Temp Service Coordinator and TSC.

## **Satisfaction with Training**

A review of table 1 shows that the majority of participants were satisfied with the training. 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 = 17**

Questions	High 5	4	3	2	Low 1	Mean
Overall rating of the training	7 (41%)	9 (53%)	1 (6%)			4.4
The trainers were knowledgeable and prepared	14 (82%)	3 (18%)				4.8
The content was useful and applicable to my job	13 (76%)	4 (24%)				4.8
Content and materials were well organized	10 (59%)	7 (41%)				4.6

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 participants frequently noted IFSP discussion, outcome training, and information about communicating effectively with families as most useful. A few participants also reported that the trainers were knowledgeable and able to answer their questions. A summary of these comments are listed below:

- The opportunity to talk with other SCs.
- Information on the role of SC
- IFSP discussion and activities: concrete recommendations regarding IFSP development using samples
- Training on outcomes and goal writing
- Information on effective communication
- Information about natural environments
- Role playing and interactive activities
- The books/resource manual and slides
- The art supplies

### 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 "Nothing" and "Cannot think of anything," some participants provided specific suggestions for future training. A summary of these comments are listed below:

- IFSP step by step writing

- More time on outcomes
- Less slides and less lecture
- More practical tools instead of PowerPoint presentations such as video
- Information on how to talk to the therapists who are not familiar with Part C
- Cultural awareness/values presentation by a specialist in the area
- Carpooling options
- Use less paper
- Healthier food choices

### **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 helpful,” “great,” “informative,” and “user friendly.” A few participants provided specific suggestions for future training, including offering IFSP goal writing training for providers and therapists, and making the training session be more eco-friendly by copying handouts on both sides and having recycling available.

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

- “Very helpful to go over the different components of our job.”
- “The training was great. I feel like the trainers made you feel comfortable and that you were able to ask questions.”
- “Wonderful. Had a lot of fun in getting to know other service coordinators.”
- “The discussion/activity portions solidified the teaching.”
- “The training was overall very helpful. I feel better prepared to help families navigate through the EI system. Training clarified many issues/questions I had previously.”



## **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: October 3, 4, and November 8, 2007, in Danville, VA. Nineteen participants 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**

Seventeen participants completed the evaluation form on the end of the training. The participants included Dedicated E.I. Service Coordinators (n=8, 42%), Service Coordinators with dual roles (n=3, 16%), Targeted Case Managers (TCM) (n=3, 16%) and "Other" (n=3, 16%). The "other" category consisted of participants with the following titles: Intake Temporary Service Coordinator, System Manager, and Temporary Service Coordinator.

## **Satisfaction with Training**

A review of table 1 shows that the majority of participants were satisfied with the training. However, there were two people who rated lower than the average in overall satisfaction. The majority of the participants rated 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 indicated that the pre and post-test questions were sufficiently covered in the content of the training.

**Table 1. Satisfaction with Training N = 19**

Questions	High 5	4	3	2	Low 1	Mean
Overall rating of the training	8 (42%)	9 (47%)		2 (11%)		4.2
The trainers were knowledgeable and prepared	14 (74%)	3 (16%)	2 (11%)			4.6
The content was useful and applicable to my job	10 (53%)	8 (42%)	1 (5%)			4.5
The pre and post test questions were sufficiently covered in the content of the training	10 (53%)	6 (32%)				4.6

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 transition information and IFSP development as most useful. Several participants also reported that they found the manuals very helpful and useful. A summary of these comments are listed below:

- Development, implementation, and review of the IFSP process
- Information and discussion of transition
- The resource binder and manuals
- Meeting other people and listening to their ideas and stories
- Cultural information
- Examples of how each system works and provides resources
- Information on natural environment

### 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 like "I feel fully informed" and "There wasn't anything that wasn't covered," a few participants provided specific suggestions for the future training. A summary of these comments are listed below:

- A manual that was complete and correct
- More information on special instruction
- More guest speakers
- More in depth information about writing on IFSP
- Practical ideas for navigating difficulties in team leading hardships

### **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:

- Provide more information to families on transition, schools, and resources in the community
- Have a better attitude and understanding of families
- Take more time to interact with families and learn about their needs
- Make sure services are family focused
- Involve parents more in IFSP process
- Improve communication with providers and following-up more often
- Make transition notebook for families and SCs
- Think about cultural competency and be aware of own belief system

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

One open-ended question asked participants for overall comments of the training. The responses of the participants were mixed. While some participants reported that the training was “very helpful” and “informative,” others commented “some info too basic” and “this training day was not so informative as the first two.” In particular, participants commented that the IFSP implementation section was “quite long and repetitive” and the trainer was “not responsive to audience zoning out.” The following are examples of some of the participant’s statements:

#### **Positives**

- “Very good overview of EI and what the duties of a SC are.”
- “I really enjoyed the training and the trainers! It was a very open training that welcomed questions and comments. It was very helpful.”

- "Great and wonderful to network and work with friends and colleagues across the state!"
- "Enjoyed training and meeting service coordinators and seeing how things are done around the state."

### **Negatives**

- "Too much redundancy and repetition in the IFSP implementation section. An example or personal experience does not need to be included after each bullet."
- "Preparing for training was time consuming on top of heavy caseload."
- "With some editing, this whole training could have been done in 2 days. Not sure I understand the logic in having people come back 1 month later for 3rd day."