



EVALUATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Thursday, January 8, 2009 ~ 2:00 p.m.

First 5 Monterey County

1125 Baldwin Street; Salinas, California 93906

Call to Order: Len Foster, Committee Chair called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

Roll Call: A legal quorum was present.

Commissioners in attendance: Len Foster and Dr. Robert Black

Committee Members, Funded Partner Representatives, Consultants and Staff in Attendance:

David Dobrowski, Evaluation Officer; Francine Rodd, Executive Director; Beth Reeves-Fortney, Sr. Program Officer; Ana González-Romo, Program Officer; Gay Spitz, Salinas Adult School; Jackie Frey, Monterey County Behavioral Health; Michelle Magee, Raul Martinez and Gary Resnick of Harder + Company and Lisa Luis, Program Support (recorder).

Approve Agenda: David Dobrowski added Item 5 - Announcements. The agenda was approved as amended.

Public Comment Period: *Members of the audience desiring to address the Commission may do so during this time. Public comments on items not already on the agenda will be accepted.*

No public comment.

Action/Information Items:

1. Approval of Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – December 11, 2008

ACTION: Upon consensus, the Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting minutes from December 11, 2008 were approved as presented.

2. Parent Interview Update – Raul Martinez, Harder + Co.

Raul reported that 80 interviews have been completed so far. Many were completed over the holiday break. This has been achieved in part because Harder + Company reduced the length of the interview and offered good incentives for participants. The Persimmony database was essential as well. Overall, the interviews are moving along very well.

3. Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA) Tools – David Dobrowski, Evaluation Officer

Five different tools were included in the meeting packet for review by Committee members. David and Harder + Company are looking for suggestions on any of the tools. The goal is to assess levels of readiness of children as they start school. The tools are being presented now to allow for plenty of time to refine and get input.

The tools presented and comments from the Committee were as follows:

1. Early Care and Education Teacher Survey

- Beth recommended that Question 1 be changed to reflect both preschool or family child care
- Francine felt a focus should be on teachers including play time, art, music and socialization

- For Question 14, one of the options should be attending a parent education class
- Add “other” as an option
- Group liked the correlation between instruments. The goal is to look at the preschool environments and look at the continuity in their kindergarten environment.

2. Kindergarten Teacher Survey

3. Early Development Instrument EDI

- The MDRDP is getting outdated and the EDI is a new tool that can be introduced and then compared with the MDRDP results.
- EDI was developed to get a good measure in the aggregate date, but not to diagnose or plan for individual children and assessments. EDI is a population based tool.
- The EDI is intended to be conducted in second half of school year, versus the MDRDP which is done at the beginning of school year.
- This “Short Form” of the EDI was developed by choosing items that show distribution and are most discriminating.
- The front page will be customized for our use (Spanish instead of French, for example)
- Len commented the EDI is an interesting instrument. It has been used and validated but with a different population. Were there studies done with communities like ours?
- Gary said there were studies done in California, with low-income families.
- Jackie expressed concern about Section B – Language and Cognitive Skills. Most children will be no, resulting in a feeling a failure.
- Gary stressed that it’s not a good tool for individual children and that the teachers will be administrating the tool. This is more about the county level looking at school readiness.
- Michelle said they would create an instruction sheet that shows how EDI and MDRDP differ, but also stress that some children won’t be able to do all items.
- Beth commented that a very important question is “Can the child ask for help?” The EDI is all peer oriented and there is nothing about the interaction between the child and teacher.
- Dr. Black is concerned if Sections D – Special Problems and E – Additional Questions were appropriate. Not many people will want to comment on Home Environment. Section E will be excluded from the Monterey County form.
- Francine reminded the group that we can’t just change the standardized tool.
- There is concern that this tool only looks at proficiency in the English language.
- In 2006 with the MDRDP, English proficiency showed to not be a factor in school readiness. It was parents, reading and preschool attendance.
- Regarding “special needs”, is this special needs or a child with an IEP? First they will find out if there is a known disability, second if not, does the teacher have concerns about that? The MDRDP has a better set of questions.

4. Modified Desired Results Developmental Profile (MDRDP)

- Will continue to use MDRDP and parent survey as they were in 2006
- MDRDP is no longer being used in California and was never been a great evaluation tool
- This is the ideal year to start using a new tool in a phased manner

5. Parent Survey

- This tool was used last time. Have removed height and weight, otherwise not much has changed
- Need to ask the parents how was the transition for them, not only how it was for their child

4. Network Analysis – Community Partner View – *Raul Martinez, Harder + Co.*

Part of the Systems Change evaluation is improving the system of services for young children in the county. First 5 Monterey County is looking to foster collaboration not only with their Funded Partners but with other community agencies/partners as well.

Raul explained that one Network Analysis was conducted with the Funded Partners and these new network maps are an attempt to show a more comprehensive picture.

Funded Partners were asked to nominate agencies they work with that are not funded by F5MC. F5MC staff and the EAC committee suggested additional agencies and a total of 70 agencies were identified.

There were 40 agencies that didn't respond at all. They some simply didn't call back or they self edited themselves out because they felt they didn't have any role in working with children and families.

The 30 agencies (43% response rate), were asked to identify their relationship with First 5 Monterey County on a four point continuum: no relationship, networking, coordination and collaboration.

Some of the significant findings included:

- The Community Partners have much fewer interactions with Funded Partners than Funded Partners have with each other.
- When you look at the Networking, Coordination and Collaboration maps you can see that Community Partners are interacting at about half the level of Funded Partners. When an interaction does take place, it's usually at the lowest level which is Networking.
- F5MC is at the center of the Collaboration which means that Community Partners have identified First 5 as an agency they often collaborate with.

This was only the first attempt and the Funded Partner survey is going out in the spring 2009. This process has generated some interest in the within other First 5's.

Comments from Committee members included:

- These agencies may have had interactions with each other, but only on an individual level. If that one person didn't receive the survey, this wouldn't show up.
- Would be helpful to have some kind of geographic reference in these maps
- The arrows appear to only be going in one direction, was this intended to show that it's a one way communication? Yes. The next step may be to ask the Funded Partners, if they agree.
- The timing of the survey was questioned. We want to avoid Funded and Community Partner burnout. Francine is concerned this may happen if it's conducted yearly. What did the Funded Partners think? Do they agree this was a special piece of the Funded Partner survey and to continue the mapping piece every year?
 - *Len is married to defining some methodology to evaluate system change. Would like to keep with it.*
 - *Jackie didn't find it hard to do, and that we would see more change over a two-year period.*
 - *Gay said they are a large agency, but only two people responded. Certain folks in agency have a broader view.*

- *If the network mapping survey is changed to every other year, we only have two more years of funding left. This would only allow for one more touch point and reduce validity.*

5. Announcements – David Dobrowski, Evaluation Officer

- a. With funding of 2-1-1 thru United Way and the Literacy Program through Community Foundation, when reporting to the State the numbers, we need to determine if we should report 29.7 % of the total (the percentage that we fund), or the entire number (since it would not happen without our portion).
- b. We will not take credit/report on all of the numbers.
- c. Economic Survey – We originally thought would be nice to survey F5MC Funded Partners on how they are handling the economic situation. David developed a survey that can go out to the Funded Partners and the Funders Group was very interested as well so there is a broader group providing feedback. NAMC may send it out as well.

March meeting for issues and concerns and how we can be supportive.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Upcoming Commission Meetings: *Unless otherwise noted, Meetings take place at: First 5 Monterey County; 1125 Baldwin Street; Salinas.*

- Regular Commission Meeting: January 26, 2009 at 9 a.m.
- Finance/Personnel Committee Meeting: January 9, 2009 at 8:30 a.m.
- Executive Committee Meeting: January 14, 2009 at 12:30 p.m.
- Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting: February 12, 2009 at 2:00 p.m.