



# 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 March 10, 11, and 31, 2004 in Charlottesville, VA. 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, pre and post test questions, convenience of location, satisfaction with food, and comfort of the environment. Participants were also asked if they would be making changes to their practice as a result of the training.

## Participant Demographics

Twenty-four participants completed the evaluation form on the last day of training. The majority of participants were Dedicated E.I. Service Coordinators (n=7, 29%). Equal numbers were Case Managers Across Disciplines (n=5, 21%) and "other" (n=5, 21%). Four were Targeted Case Managers (17%) and two Primary Case Managers (8%) attended the training. The majority of participants reported to be working full time (n=18, 75%). The majority of participants worked in the Northern Virginia (n=7, 29%), Richmond Central (n=6, 25%) and Tidewater (n=6, 25%). Fewer participants worked in Southwest Virginia (n=3, 13%) and Southside Richmond (n=1, 4%). Most participants reported working in either an urban (n=9, 38%) or suburban (n=9, 38%) community, while six participants (25%) reported working in a rural setting.

## Satisfaction with Training

A review of table 1 (below) indicates that the majority of participants "agreed" that the pre-training activities were helpful. The majority of participants "strongly agreed" that the trainers were knowledgeable and prepared and "agreed" that the content was useful. Pre and post- test questions were well received with all participants either "strongly agreeing" or "agreeing" that the questions were sufficiently covered in the content of the training. The majority of participants "agreed" that the location was convenient, food was satisfactory and environment was comfortable.

**Table 1. Satisfaction with Training N=24**

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
The pre-training activities were helpful.	n=3 (13%)	n=13 (54%)	n=4 (17%)	n=3 (13%)
The trainers were knowledgeable and prepared.	n=21 (88%)	n=3 (13%)	n=0 (0%)	n=0 (0%)
The content was useful	n=12 (50%)	n=11 (46%)	n=1 (4%)	n=0 (0%)
The pre and post-test questions were adequately covered in the content of the training.	n=7 (29%)	n=14 (58%)	n=0 (0%)	n=0 (0%)
The location was convenient	n=6 (25%)	n=13 (54%)	n=3 (13%)	n=1 (4%)
The food was satisfactory	n=6 (25%)	n=14 (58%)	n=4 (17%)	n=0 (0%)
The environment was comfortable	n=6 (25%)	n=14 (58%)	n=3 (13%)	n=1 (4%)

Averages may not total 100% due to missing data.

### **Pre-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:

- Having an idea of what to expect.
- Navigating the state web page.
- Goal writing/IFSP develop.
- Made me think about what I use in my position and all the roles I play.
- Interesting to hear a little about each person and the area they are from.
- Council meeting attendance.
- Browsing the websites was helpful to better learn about the system.
- Going to an interagency council coordination meeting.
- Helped to get us thinking about what we would be doing.
- Looking up information online and getting information off websites.

Least useful activities:

- It was too time consuming [this was mentioned by several participants].
- Doing the internet search to answer questions.
- The hat activity, but this was also the most fun!
- I use the ITC VA website regularly; I use the internet frequently at work as a resource information guide – so it was least useful for me.
- I don't have a lot of free time at work to prepare for seminars.
- The time spent didn't equal what I got out of these activities.
- Writing out identifiers on IFSP.
- The information was a little overwhelming; had little meaning to me as a new employee.

- The cultural sensitivity questions; not to say cultural sensitivity is not important!; may be addressing it via a person.
- Things that were already implemented in the program such as the IFSP pages.

### **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:

- Changes to the IFSP process such as how to write it using functional goals and outcomes, how to include the family, and how to meet Medicaid requirements, know what are optional and required forms.
- Will take more time to explain safeguards.
- I learned more about how children qualify for services
- I learned about APT and the roles of Service Coordinators.
- How to work more as a team.
- How to be a better facilitator.
- Learned how “premature” is not considered a delay.
- I very much appreciated the resource and service notebooks and contents. It was beautifully formatted and east to use.

One participant elaborated about the potential conflict between implementing what was learned and agency policy stating, “I will give a list of things we’re not doing to my supervisor and she will probably decide which ones we will immediately implement and come up with a plan for implementing some in the future, although I’m sure a lot of these things won’t match up with our individual agency’s policies so that is somewhat confusing and decisions/choices will have to be made.”

### **Pre and Post Test Questions**

One question asked participants for overall comments about the pre and posttest questions. The majority of comments were positive and have been summarized below:

- A good review of the sections.
- Made me want to pay attention.
- Although I have been working for a year, I didn’t know some of the answers.

Two persons commented that the tests did not promote learning for them because they were overloaded with too much information already and stated the following:

“The pretest questions raised my awareness of what I should know and what I need to learn.”

“I believe the pretest questions were a good idea and helped me look out for answers throughout the training.”

“Very helpful to track and identify what I learned over the 3 day training.”

### **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 commented on the relevance and need for the training. Trainers were thought to be well prepared, knowledgeable, and personable. The training was well organized. Some participants commented that there could have been fewer activities and more content of material. Making hats was the activity that generated the most comments. Some participants seemed to enjoy this activity, while others felt uncomfortable sharing their hats and what it all meant. One participant thought it was a somewhat sexist activity. Participants expressed satisfaction learning about IFSPs and networking with others. Others expressed that training should be three days in a row and should be offered at least yearly or more often. Some requested that the IFSP section offer more detail. Some specific quotes are offered below:

“Out of all of the part C trainings I have attended in the past 4 years this training has been the most helpful, comfortable, and understandable as my role as service coordinator.”

“Training was extremely organized and well run; I appreciate this greatly; there was a lot of great, applicable information disseminated; I also appreciated being able to talk to and interact with service coordinators from all over the state; the only criticism would be that a lot of the stuff taught seemed to assume a lot of prior knowledge, which is difficult for those of us who have not been doing this very long.

“I found this training to be very valuable; it’s nice to know that our daily challenges are showed by most SC; in addition – going over the paperwork in detail made things more understandable

“Wasn’t extremely beneficial after 1 year of working- would have been better when first started.”

“For individuals well informed through years of work experience/education, it would have been nice to have the ability to opt out of day 1 agenda/activities.”

### **Pre- and Post Test Examination**

A twenty-item examination was offered to participants as a way to measure change in knowledge and evaluate the effectiveness of the training. The following results

indicate improvement in the majority of participants. Only three out of twenty four participants demonstrated no change in knowledge.

Table 2. Participant scores on pre and posttest.

Participant	20 points possible		
	Pre test (% correct)	Post test (% correct)	% change
A	45% (9)	75% (15)	+30%
B	85% (17)	90% (18)	+5%
C	60% (12)	85% (17)	+25%
D	75% (15)	75% (15)	+0%
E	80% (16)	80% (16)	+0%
F	60% (12)	75% (15)	+15%
G	60% (12)	90% (18)	+30%
H	65% (13)	80% (16)	+15%
I	80% (16)	90% (18)	+10%
J	65% (13)	70% (14)	+5%
K	45% (9)	80% (16)	+35%
L	70% (14)	70% (14)	+0%
M	80% (16)	90% (18)	+10%
N	70% (14)	80% (16)	+10%
O	85% (17)	90% (19)	+5%
P	65% (13)	75% (15)	+10%
Q	60% (12)	75% (15)	+15%
R	75% (15)	100%(20)	+25%
S	65% (13)	95% (19)	+30%
T	70% (14)	80% (16)	+10%
U	75% (15)	85% (17)	+10%
V	85% (17)	85% (17)	+0%
W	90% (18)	95% (19)	+5%
X	65% (13)	80% (16)	+15%
<b>Total 24</b>	Mean 69.79%	Mean 82.92%	Mean 13.1%