



EVALUATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Thursday, March 13, 2008 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 2:09 p.m.

Roll Call: A legal quorum was present.

Commissioners in attendance: Len Foster. Robert L. Black arrived at 2:39 p.m.

Committee Members, Funded Partner Representatives, Consultants and Staff in Attendance: David Dobrowski, Evaluation Officer; Larry Imwalle, Action Council; Gay Spitz, Salinas Adult School; Raul Martinez and Michelle Magee, Harder + Company and Lisa Luis, Program Support (recorder).

Approve Agenda:

The agenda was approved with the addition of an Item 7.

Item 7: F5CA Request for Unduplicated Service Numbers.

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 presented.

Action/Information Items:

1. Approval of Evaluation Committee Meeting Minutes – February 14, 2008

ACTION: Upon consensus, the Evaluation Advisory Committee meeting minutes for February 14, 2008 were approved as presented.

2. SNP RFQ Update – David Dobrowski

We realized that we needed more information on the Special Needs Project than what was covered in their regular Program Evaluation Plans. An RFQ was released on March 6th and submissions are due on Friday, March 21st. Harder+Company is planning to bid on the RFQ. Len asked if Harder was selected as the SNP Evaluator, would we simply modify their current contract. The selection would still have to go before the Commission, and does not really save any steps for us.

3. Internal Review Board (IRB) Update – Raul Martinez

F5MC and Harder + Company sought to have human subject protection due to the fact that they will soon be conducting the pre and post interviews, and the process will be more rigorous this year. A month ago, the Evaluation Team sought to have the WestEd IRB as the IRB of record. The Evaluation Team worked on the consent form and the survey. It looks like the evaluation may be exempt from IRB review because it is closely to Program Evaluation than a Research Study. The IRB had many questions for Raul in regards to explaining in-depth what it is that First 5 does, which required several lengthy conversations.

4. **Persimmony Update** – *David Dobrowski*

David shared that the Persimmony contract is completed and ready to be signed. F5MC is required to be on their insurance as an additional insured. This contract was previously authorized by the Commission, and Francine Rodd has the authority to execute it.

5. **Systems Change Survey** – *Raul Martinez*

Raul referenced the handout titled “Draft ELO Systems Level Cross Cutting Indicators and Proposed Measures”. The survey is now more about the nature of the interactions of Funded Partners and those outside of F5MC funding. Raul and Michelle need to get the committee’s input on the focus areas today.

Constructs/Categories are:

- Inter-Agency Collaboration
- Inter-Agency Collaboration
- ELO Strategic Plan Essential Characteristics
- Perceptions of working with F5MC Staff and Commission
- Program Development and Sustainability
- Special Needs Systems

The large report won’t include all of these categories. Literature already indicates that many people are aware, but it’s the working together and sharing of resources that needs to be improved upon. Committee discussed how these were going to be measured.

Comments on Inter-Agency Collaboration included:

- What kind of interactions are the Funded Partners having with each other?
- For some programs (MCSTART collaboration, SNP collaboration), they may have another section of questions for them. Over time, other collaborations may develop and we want to capture that. The goal is to reach in-depth, not just the wide range picture.
- Is there a will and resources to work with other non-funded agencies?
- Gay and Larry thought that the questions looked good.
- Gay is interested in looking at the complete tool.
- It will be a web based survey, will be piloted, and items will be dropped or added as they determine what is or is not working.

6. **Case Study Indicators** – *Raul Martinez*

Raul explained the various dimensions in the “Program-Level Implementation and Outcome Evaluation Case Study” handout. It’s a strategy to help agencies build capacity to execute their programs. The exploratory part of this is that we want programs to be at their optimal state.

Best Practice Use

- The case study will be looking to see if the programs are using best practices and have they implemented them.
- Gay shared they have the challenge that there is not a lot of identified best practices for Parent Educators. First 5 needs to assist the Funded Partners in finding those best practices, as well as promising practices.
- David asked if Gay felt that in general the Funded Partners would like to have more training on best practices. Yes, if ties to outcomes, would be a good direction to go in.

- Keep in mind that many programs are in startup mode and it can be overwhelming for newer programs. If a program is just starting, it would be the ideal time to use Best Practices. The committee suggested the label should be expanded to include Promising Practices.

Scope of Work Consistency

- This dimension will look at whether or not programs were able to serve the number of families they had anticipated in their scopes of work.
- Are programs able to achieve their goals and what are the barriers to that?
- Has the quality of service increased six months later and has access improved.

Participant Satisfaction

Evaluation Capacity

- Even though it looks like a lot of questions in this dimension, there's been much work done along some of these indicators already with their PEP's. Harder will be reviewing scopes of work, tri-annual reports, and site visits. Not all of this information will need to come directly from a staff/program person.
- Dr. Black commented that individual parents may have very different perspectives on how they think the programs are doing.

7. F5CA Request for Unduplicated Service Numbers - David Dobrowski

David explained that First 5 California had emailed a request asking F5MC to estimate what percentage of service numbers from last year were duplicated across agencies. The state commission very strongly wants an unduplicated number from each county.

Len wondered if we have to provide this information. Can we simply state we don't collect this data and could only take a guess? Are there any consequences if we don't supply a number? David felt that it could damage our relationship with F5CA.

Dr. Black shared that it's clearly impossible. We have programs starting up all the time and they may or may not include the same people.

Larry asked if from David's perspective, is there any reasonable basis on deriving these estimates, a reasonable methodology?

David knows that Community Oral Health does not duplicate with many agencies. Would remove them and for everyone else it's about half the numbers. On average, a person would go to two services.

The group consensus was that David should communicate to Francine that the Evaluation Advisory Committee felt it was inappropriate to make a guess. Group agreed that David should provide a number of 60%, plus or minus 40%.

Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 2:52 p.m.

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

- Annual Commission "Advance": March 31, 2008 from 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Location: Monterey County Government Building - Esselen Room
168 West Alisal Street, Third Floor; Salinas, CA

- Regular Commission Meeting: April 28, 2008 at 9:00 a.m.
- Finance/Personnel Committee Meeting: April 4, 2008 at 8:30 a.m.
- Executive Committee Meeting: April 9, 2008 at 12:30 p.m.
- Evaluation Advisory Committee Meeting: April 10, 2008 at 2:00 p.m.