



KALEIDOSCOPE

New Perspectives in
Service Coordination
LEVEL I

The Partnership for People with Disabilities offered the *Kaleidoscope: New Perspectives in Service Coordination - Level I Training* to service coordinators on **September 24-25 and October 22, 2003 in Bristol, VA**. This report will cover the evaluation of the training conducted at that time.

One instrument was used to evaluate participants' satisfaction with the training. Besides demographic information, participants were asked about their satisfaction with the knowledge of the presenters, pre-training activities, training content, pre and posttest questions, location, 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.

A total of 14 participants returned a completed training evaluation form. The participants consisted of Case Managers Across Disciplines (64%, n=9), Dedicated E.I. Service Coordinators (21%, n=3), and "other" (14%, n=2) which comprised of a Council Coordinator and a Program Administrator. Most participants worked full time (85%, n=11) while only two participants (15%) worked part time. Most participants reported to be working in Southwest Virginia (93%, n=13). Only one participant (7%) reported to work in Richmond Central. Most participants reported to work in a rural community (71%, n=10). Only three participants (21%) worked in an urban community, and one participant (7%) worked in a suburban community. The majority of participants (57%, n=8) reported to have worked less than one year in E. I. services. Those who worked more than a year worked an average of 9 years. Similarly, the majority of participants (67%, n=8) reported to have worked as a service coordinator for less than a year, while those who worked more than a year worked an average of 8 years.

Overall, the majority of participants indicated that they were very satisfied with almost all aspects of the training. High marks were particularly noted on the items that asked if the trainers were knowledgeable and prepared, and if the content was useful. Written comments also suggested a high degree of satisfaction with the training and many participants commented about the positive changes they plan to make as a result of the training they received. All but three participants improved their scores on the posttest exam. For more detailed analysis, refer to the following tables and summaries.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The pre-training activities were helpful...	(57%, n=8)	(36%, n=5)	(7%, n=1)	----
2. The trainers were knowledgeable and prepared.....	(93%, n=13)	(7%, n=1)	----	----
3. The content was useful.....	(86%, n=12)	(14%, n=2)	----	----
4. The pre and posttest questions were adequately covered the content of the training?	(64%, n=9)	(36%, n=5)	----	----
<hr/>				
The location was convenient.....	(57%, n=8)	(21%, n=3)	(21%, n=3)	----
The food was satisfactory.....	(57%, n=8)	(43%, n=6)	----	----
The environment was comfortable.....	(79%, n=11)	(21%, n=3)	----	----

Specifically, what was *most* and *least* useful about the pre-training activities?

Most Useful: Those items that were cited as most useful included cultural diversity, websites, transition, and IFSP development. Others commented how these activities “stimulated questions that could be addressed at the training” and “encouraged me to think about things before I got to the training.” One participant commented upon how “the trainers answered questions thoroughly and [were] very helpful and friendly.”

Least Useful: Four participants stated that there was nothing about the pre-training activities that was not useful. One participant commented that the information about the history of Part C was useful to them, but not for families. Another participant commented that the council meeting wasn’t useful because they worked as a council coordinator. One participant stated that bringing an item that represented their community wasn’t useful, although it built rapport.

Will you be making changes to your practice as a result of this training? If yes, what?

If no, why not?

Twelve participants commented on this question. The responses were varied and included making positive changes in the following areas: transition, cultural competency, IFSP goals and outcomes, communication with family members, aware of different roles, and review local policies and procedures to make sure staff are up to date.

Overall comments about the pre and posttest?

Ten participants commented on this question. Some comments were positive in that the tests were “a good assessment tool.” The pre and posttests helped them recognize weaknesses, and was “relevant to the material presented - covered a good cross section of the training.” However, some comments indicated that the tests were “a little

overwhelming since [I am] still in [the] learning process.” Others commented that some questions had confusing wording or seemed “almost tricky.”

Overall comments about the training?

Twelve participants commented on this question. The vast majority made positive statement about the training such as: “very informational,” “acquired several useful resources,” “excellent materials,” “trainers were awesome and knew the material,” “offered a fresh perspective,” “loved having art stuff on the tables, overall one of the most comfortable trainings I’ve attended.” One participant commented, “Some information was redundant if you have been doing this for a while” while another commented, “this was a great overview for beginning service coordinators.”

Pre and Posttests

Fifteen participants took the pre and post exams. All but three participants made gains in knowledge. An average of 2 to 3 points were gained among those who improved their scores.

Participant scores on pre and posttests:

Participant	20 points possible		Change
	Pre test (% correct)	Post test (% correct)	
A	50% (10)	65% (13)	+3
B	55% (11)	65% (13)	+2
C	60% (12)	70% (14)	+2
D	65% (13)	75% (15)	+2
E	65% (13)	85% (17)	+4
F	65% (13)	95% (19)	+6
G	70% (14)	75% (15)	+1
H	70% (14)	85% (17)	+3
I	75% (15)	85% (17)	+2
J	75% (15)	75% (15)	0
K	80% (16)	80% (16)	0
L	85% (17)	95% (19)	+2
M	85% (17)	100% (20)	+3
N	85% (17)	90% (19)	+2
O	90% (20)	80% (16)	-4