National Evaluation of the State and Child Health Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems (SECCS) Grant Program

March 29, 2006

DENA GREEN: Good afternoon, and good morning to those of you joining us from a different time zone.

As a participant in this webcast you will have a opportunity to email questions to the presenters once both have completed their presentations. First I'll give you Jennifer and Alicia.

JENNIFER KUO: Great. Thank you very much, Dena, for the introduction. My name is Jennifer Kuo of the Lewin Group. The purpose of today's webcast is to provide is an overview of the national evaluation that the Lewin Group is conducting at the state early childhood grant program. Many have heard about the evaluation and have spoken with a consultant about your program. You may not know the purpose of the evaluation or what your role will be. Hopefully by the end of today's presentation your questions will be answered and also have a better understanding what your role will be in the evaluation. On the next slide you'll see that in addition to describing the purpose of the national evaluation, we'll also provide an overview of the evaluation activities, timeline, also present some of the various data collection tools and activities that will be part of the evaluation, and we'll also review in detail one of the data collection tools, the minimum data set survey. Last year the Maternal and Child Health con -- [inaudible] Lewin is a national health care firm located outside Washington D.C. We have a long history of

working with the bureau, as well as extensive experience in protecting program evaluation.

The purpose of the national evaluation is two-fold. It will help to assess the progress and effectiveness of the state initiative, and meeting its goal of fostering early childhood assistance development at the state level. Second of all, will help to assess the technical assistance being provided to the implementation grantee. It will help the bureau with timely feedback made which will help to inform program planning. It's important to note the national evaluation we are conducting is an initiative level evaluation and not evaluation of specific grantee projects. I will now provide an overview of the evaluation activities and timeline for the national evaluation. As I mentioned previously, the national evaluation will span two years. Year one of the evaluation is currently in progress. It began last September and will continue into September of this year. Year one of the evaluation will evaluate the cohort of implementation grantees awarded in 2005. Currently a total of 20 that are included in year one of the evaluation. Evaluation that we are conducting is, includes both qualitative and quantitative techniques, and employs both primary and secondary data.

The first year of the evaluation includes a variety of activities. First provide an overview and then go into each one in more detail. The first activity is a development of grantee profiles and logic models for each of the grantees. To date we have completed profiles and logic models for 17 of the 20 grantees, and will be completing profiles and logic models for the remaining three in the next couple of months. Another component of the

evaluation is conducting telephone interviews and site visits with each of the 20 implementation grantees. This will take place in June and July of this year and allow us to obtain qualitative data on the progress grantees are making. Another is the administration of the minimum data set or MPS survey. It will be administered to all the grantees and take place in August and September of this year. The survey, unlike the telephone interviews and site visits, will allow us to obtain more data. It's an ongoing activity for us, and a report on the 2005 cohort of implementation grantees. This will be developed in October and provide data collected during the year.

On the next slide, for year two of the evaluation, you'll see that it takes place in September of this year until September of 2007. The year two evaluation will log an evaluation of the implementation grantees awarded in 2006. Evaluation activities that will be conducted in year two will mirror those currently being conducted in year one of the evaluation. Once again, grantee profiles and logic models will be developed for each of the 2006 cohort of grantee, and this will happen in the latter part of this year, in November and December. Telephone interviews and site visits will also be conducted for the 2006 cohort of grantees, which will be conducted in the early summer of 2007. Minimum data set survey administered to grantees as well, which will occur in the late summer of 2007. Similar to the first year of the evaluation, Lewin will be coordinating on an ongoing basis throughout year two of the evaluation. Lastly, Lewin will develop a final evaluation report on those 2005 and 2006 cohort of implementation grantees. And this evaluation report will be completed in September of 2007. Next I would like to review each of the data collection activities and tools I just mentioned in a bit more detail.

Starting with the grantee profiles. You'll see on the next slide. The purpose of developing grantee profiles is to gain a baseline understanding of each of the grantee programs. For the 2005 cohort of implementation grantees, we have used grantee applications and other program documents to complete the grantee profile. To date we have completed 17 of the 20 2005 grantees. We'll be developing grantee profiles for the remaining three in the next couple of months. Each contains information across six areas. The first area is background information on the grantee project. This includes information on the project's name, state lead agency, the agency contact information, activities that pertain to early childhood, project period, state early childhood directed by the project, and lastly, existing early childhood initiatives in the state outside of the lead agency, excuse me, outside of the lead agency. The second area included in the grantee profile, key partner organizations for each of the grantee programs. And these are organized by type and name of partner organizations. The type of organization relates to the sector the partner organization represents. Examples of sectors include child care, education, mental health, human and social office, labor, business, government, academic center.

A third area is information on the project's design. This includes each of the project's mission, their goals, their objectives, target population that they are serving, as well as the geographic service area. The fourth component covered by the grantee profile includes information on each of the grantees implementation activities and strategies. Strategies and activities for each of the five critical component area of development are listed for each of the grantees. The five areas include access to medical home and health

insurance, mental health and social emotional development, early care education and child care, parenting education and family support. The last two sections of the grantee profile, information on sustainability, as well as their approach to their local or grantee-specific evaluation. On the next slide you'll notice that in addition to the grantee profiles, we have also developed logic models for each of the 2005 implementation grantees. Similar to the grantee profiles, we have developed logic models for 17 of the 20 2005 implementation grantees, and will have logic models for the next couple of months. It's a core component of the evaluation project. [Inaudible] impact of the activities. Logic models also provide a road map linking what a program does and how to measure the achievement. It articulates what they are trying to accomplish, for whom, with what resources, within what context, and facing what barriers. In addition, logic models will help each of the grantees specify data needed to show whether the program is effective in meeting its goals and objectives. Models were developed to help ensure the grantees' expected outcomes to be logically linked to their planned activities and that the grantees are collecting or identifying the evidence by which to show program achievement.

On the next slide you'll see a basic logic model framework. Not exactly what each grantee's model looks like, but we did use the framework to develop the grantee's logic model. You can see the linkage between program input, outcome, and how it feeds into and impacts the program process. And developing each of the grantees' logic models, we used information from the application as well as other program documents. We also conducted telephone interviews with each of the implementation grantees, to have information contained at the logic model. Each includes information on their organizational

structure and environment, inputs and resources into each of the programs, target population for each of the grantee program, interventions and activities they plan to conduct, the outcome or expected changes from the activities they hope to see, as well as evidence of change, indicators they plan to track over the implementation grant period. Lastly, the logic models also include information on barriers and facilitators to conducting the activities they plan over the grant period. For some of the logic models we develop for the 2005 cohort grantee, clearly articulated outcomes and indicators are missing. And speaking with the grantee during the logic model interviews, some admission that they haven't had the opportunity to sit down with the program staff to clearly articulate outcomes and indicators. We encourage grantees to take the time to do this. Help them have evidence at the end of the grant period showing whether or not they were able to achieve their project's goals and outcomes.

Continued assistance with developing outcomes and indicators, identifying which data sources to use, please see technical assistance. Chris Botsko will talk more about that later in the presentation. Logic models developed as part of this investigation not only helps Lewin to help understand each grantee program and what they hope to achieve, but also assisted the bureau in program planning, as well as the grantees to help define and community the goals and objective, among all program and partner agency staffs. Another data collection activity that we will undertake in both years one and two of the evaluation is telephone interviews and site visits with each of the implementation grantees. Telephone interviews and site visits will provide us with qualitative data on the progress and achieving the requirements stating in the implementation grant guidance. Also provide

qualitative data on the quality and effectiveness on the assistance currently being provided for the grantee. In both years one and two of the evaluation, site visits will be conducted at two grantee sites. While the remainder of the grantees will be interviewed via telephone. The two grantees in years one and two of the evaluation will be selected with guidance of the bureau. Number of preexisting childhood programs, as well as the size of the target population, and telephone interviews last two to four hours, and the site visits will be conducted over one day or over one and a half days.

You'll notice on the next slide a variety of people will be interviewed as well as site visited. Including program staff, other lead agency representatives, partnership representatives, community stakeholders, as well as other relevant stakeholders. A series of open-ended questions will be asked, and all the questions will relate to the requirements outlined in the implementation grant guidance. Seven different topic areas will be covered. First area will be descriptive and background information on the program. Want to better understand all the factors that led the program to seek state funding as well as the context and political environment in which each of the programs operate.

A second topic area covered by the site visits and telephone interviews will be integration. Ask about the progress the programs have made in each of the five critical component areas. We want to know what improvements they have seen in these five areas, as well as barriers and facilitators they have encountered. Partnership is the third area to be covered. Questions will include challenges of facilitators to maintaining, as well as what the partnerships have allowed the programs to achieve they otherwise could not have

achieved. Community involvement and input is the fourth topic area covered by the site visits and telephone interviews. One will learn how successful the program has been and engaging consumers, community groups, families, and programs, as well as things they have encountered in the process. A fifth area will be sustainability. Want to know what progress grantees have made in attempting to sustain their state's programs beyond the grant funding period. Also learn about any efforts that have been made in getting upgrading of partners, as well as successful and unsuccessful strategies grantees interest tried.

A sixth area covered during the site visits and telephone interviews will be the quality and effectiveness of the technical staff. Want to know whether or not grantees have been addressed adequately and effectively. And want to know if they have a recommendation. Lastly, gather information on lessons learned and the impact of the program. We'll ask questions about the impact of the program on the target population, the agency, larger community, as well as the early childhood in each of the states, and know about any unanticipated outcome of the program efforts, any ripple effects of the program, and what would have happened to the early childhood without the program. Now I would like to turn over to Alicia Thomas who has an overview of the data set survey.

ALICIA THOMAS: Good afternoon, everyone. As Jennifer had previously mentioned on the timeline of year one activity, we are expecting to administer the MDS survey to all 20 grantees approximately August, September of this year. And then we will have the second phase of it in year two. On the next slide I minimum data set survey is going to allow us to

provide quantitative data -- implementation grant program guidance, and want to look at the quality and effectiveness of other things provided as Jennifer previously mentioned. And this survey is pilot tested among three grantees, and we are in the process of selecting the three grantees now, they will receive final approval by MCHB and will start the first week of April, so they will be notified in two, three days. Looking forward to this, the pilot test has four main purposes. One is look at the clarity and comprehensiveness of the questions we are asking. Another evaluate the effectiveness. And the availability of data needed to complete or respond to the questions we have.

And finally, look at the burden on grantees to complete the survey in terms of staff hours, costs, things of that nature. And then we are going to follow the pilot testing and will insert the results into the clearance process that we are conducting, and that will be submitted. Currently the survey is available on the federal register for comment for a 60-day period, so grantees can actually look at a draft of the survey at this point. Once we receive the results from the O and B package, make appropriate changes and then submitted as a finalized survey in August and September. And we are going to take this and submit it to grantees via electronic email. We can do by mail or by fax. We'll be using the preferences of the grantees for that process. Now looking at actual draft survey, it is composed of six sections, and these six sections were based on the requirements in the program guidance. And the areas are service integration, partnership, community involvement and impact, the development of the grantees' local evaluation plan, sustainability plan, and the quality and effectiveness of the technical assistance provided.

Next slide. Looking at the first area of service integration, we are going to be interested in learning how to, and to what extent the grant program has achieved the integration and the five critical component areas of the early childhood systems development. In addition to questions on strategies, we are also going to be looking at asking questions of key indicators. Some of the things we are looking at include the strategies you use to improve access to health insurance for children and parents, we'll be looking at strategies used to improve the access to medical homes for children, as well as the numbers of children and parents with health insurance. Looking at the number of children with medical, with a medical home. And also be looking at strategies used to address the mental health and social and emotional development needs of children. For these questions, feel free to provide actual concrete numbers. If not, please provide your best estimate of these values. One important result of asking the questions and getting your response, we want to make sure the data is actually out there and available for you to answer the questions, and if not, we'll look into modifying the survey accordingly. In addition, if grantees have trouble identifying data sources, as Jennifer mentioned, this may be an opportunity to submit a request for help and/or particularly you may be able to talk with other grantees on the things they have used.

Next slide. This continues with addition -- additional examples of questions we asked if needs have been addressed. Looking at strategies used. We are also looking at the numbers of children whose early learning, health and development of social competence has been supported. And we are also interested in the types of parenting education services you provided, numbers of parents receiving education service, and the types of

family support services you provided. And finally, also interested in the number of families actually receiving family support services. Next slide. In this area we are looking at partnership, and interested in learning about the formal and the informal partnerships you develop as part of your implementation project, as well as learning how the initial impact leads to partnership. We are looking at the numbers of the formal partnership developed, involved from the planning phase if applicable, also interested in the numbers of partners you have developed MOUs or MOAs, and also the number of partnerships internally in the organization, interested in the types of contribution your partners have provided, as well as the sectors in which the partners are represented. To answer these questions you should feel free to complete this and to use any resource available, including consulting with your partners for their input.

Next slide. Again, and looking at partnerships, we are interested in things like the level of community partnerships, and areas like co-existence, and grantees should know in the survey we have defined the various levels of partnership so there should be no concern about adequately defining what we mean when we say these questions, we will include that terminology and the definition. And also the strength and productivity, such as the partners actually involved in the partnership and attend meetings regularly. Interested in the partners who have credibility within outside agencies and organizations. Also the types of resources you have among the partners and finally, looking at the impact of the partnership.

Next slide. The next area involves community involvement and impact. In this section we are interested in learning about the ways in which your program involves the community and families, as well as the impact the state ECCS program has had on the community, and some of the things we are examining are the evidence and the extent to which the input of the community group is taken into account in the implementation process. And also what you have used and engaged to involve consumers, community groups and family member, public forum, community town meetings and free events. Additionally, the types of roles that others have played in the implementation process itself, and also looking at the evidence that the implementation process has had an impact on the members of the community.

Next slide. Next area the MDS survey, looking at the development of the grantees local evaluation plan. In this section we are interested in learning about your progress in developing the local evaluation plan for your grant program. And here we are referring to when we say local, the grantee specific evaluation, important to the evaluation plan that you have either submitted during your application or any revisions. We use the term local to signify the difference between the grantees' project level evaluation versus the national program evaluation that the Lewin Group is conducting. And during this section we'll be looking at information such as the number of grantees that have developed locally evaluation plans. Number of grantees that have developed a corset of early childhood indicators that include measuring service system performance. Looking at the types of methods used to identify the corset of indicators, as well as the type of criteria you have used to identify the corset of indicators.

Next slide. Additionally, we are interested in the challenges you have had in identifying your corset of indicators, as well as the numbers of grantees that have developed the necessary data infrastructure that you'll be using to collect, analyze and evaluate the data you have on your indicators. And finally, looking at evidence that your necessary data infrastructure or systems are in place to collect, analyze and evaluate this data. Next slide. In the next area, we are looking at the development of your sustainability plan. Interested about learning about your progress for continuing your project beyond implementation grant period. Some of the things we are examining here, the number of grantees that have developed the sustainability plan to support the plan beyond the funding period. Looking at the types of financing strategy you have used in continuing your implementation of the project, such as pursuing policy changes, leveraging and pursuing grant opportunities. Interested in the barriers and challenges you have had in carrying out the strategies and other sustainability methods. Interested in the types of policy-related activities undertaken to help sustain your program, and also interested in the evidence that your program specific funds will be available to support the state program and beyond the funding period.

Next slide. The final area looking at in the minimum data set survey is the quality and the effectiveness of technical assistance. We are interested in learning about the T.A. resources available to grantees, quality and effectiveness of the T.A. you have received while working on your implementation plan, and son of the things we are looking at are again the types of requests you received, the quality and the effectiveness of the T.A. that

you have received in meeting your needs, and looking at your satisfaction with the T.A. that you have received during the implementation phase of this initiative.

Next slide. This information here contains the contact details for Jennifer and myself at the Lewin Group. If you have any questions, feel free to give us a call or send us an email. We would like to reiterate the selected grantees will be notified soon and hope to begin testing the pilot the end of next week. The results will go into the O and B clearance process, and it takes about three months. Hopefully we'll have the final survey by August or September of this year. At that time we will provide instructions on how to complete the survey, as well as how to return it back to us, and we look forward to any questions you have. So please feel free to utilize the information or assistance of any people necessary when you are filling out this survey, it can include your program staff, partners, individuals that have information that may help you filling out the survey. And finally, we will submit a reminder of this, for the grantees actually selected to pilot the survey, probably a good idea if you would save a copy of the survey that you work on because once the process is complete and we have received a finalized survey, all 20 grantees will be required to fill out the MDS survey, and therefore it is hoped that you can update your information with what's happened in the past few months between the pilot phase and the finalization of the survey, therefore you would not hopefully have to do everything from scratch. That's the end of my presentation. Thank you.

DENA GREEN: Chris Botsko will now present. He'll talk about some of the ideas that you might be thinking of in evaluating your own individual program. Christopher.

CHRIS BOTSKO: Other side. Thank you very much, Dena. Jennifer and Alicia gave a great overview, it's designed to look at it as a whole. As the grantees know, will is also a requirement to conduct your own evaluation. Everyone involved with this project recognizes that you have limited resources to conduct evaluations. Unless you are getting outside support, it is very difficult to do the work involved in this ambitious initiative and complete an evaluation. Therefore we recognize you need to do something that is both useful and cost effective.

The next slide I have provided an overview what I want to talk about today, and my goal today is to spend a little time talking about your evaluations. This is not intended to be a comprehensive view of what you have to do with an evaluation, and if you have particular concerns and issues you want to discuss, I strongly encourage you to get in touch with me and/or your project officer. What I want to do is discuss the purpose of the individual evaluation to provide some resources that can be used in developing an evaluation plan, and also to discuss possible technical assistance on an evaluation.

The next slide I show some of the functions of the grantee evaluation. One is to support or enhance support for the initiative. If you do a successful evaluation plan it can help you talk about what you are trying to achieve and what you think will happen. And one of the important pieces of evaluation plan is really to kind of put together what you think the results of your initiative are going to be. Funding agencies, private businesses, governors and legislature often wants you to talk about the results you are trying to achieve, and

evaluation plan should include efforts and measures and ways you are going to measure those results. Evaluation for initiative like this should also be able to provide information that could help you make mid course corrections. We are certainly hoping and while this is uncertain, we hope it will be around for a while longer. At some point something is likely to go wrong with what you achieve in the plan. If you decide to examine such things, look at the evaluation and say here is why we think that didn't work, and then figure out what you can do to move forward. Evaluation is important for sustainability. [Inaudible] all our kids is a community level covering ten communities in Illinois. When Ralph was asked about plans for seeking statewide funding to bring to scale throughout the state the goal was to amass a few years of evaluation data, assuming it looks good, go to the legislature or other funders and say here is what we have accomplished. Don't you think you should be doing it elsewhere. Without evaluation of some sort, you are much less likely to win that argument but with the evaluation you can bring the argument something like that should go to scale.

On the next slide I start talking about some of the resources that can be used in evaluation. Logic models as Jennifer said are frequently used to form the foundation for an evaluation. I know states have been excited about receiving Lewin logic models. As she also pointed out, some states will not really gotten to the point where they had really clearly defined the results they were trying to achieve. For those of you who have not received logic models, you were not in the first phase of the initiative, you might want to explore developing your own logic model. One resource to help you do that comes from the WW Kellogg foundation, created a logic model development guide. And the website is

on the slide. They include a section on theory of change logic models which show what you expect to, what actions you expect to take and how you expect those actions to change your system. And Charlie Bruner is using one of those. And both of these can overlap, it's a very useful tool for those of you interested in looking closer at the plan to develop your own logic model or enhancing the Lewin model for your own evaluation purposes.

The next slide I talk about what you might want to include in the evaluation plan. In part, a lot of these things are required as part of the initiative. So you, in things part of your evaluation plan include indicators, and measures of success at the community level. A lot of you are building a key part of your ECCS effort, looking at ways of making changes at the community level. You have developed plans that include extensive comprehensive community building level, and measuring success at the community level. And measuring the systems change. There are lots of issues and limitations regarding availability of data on the well-being of children and families, I think it is fair to say we know more about pursuing that than we do measuring the success of systems change. As he again pointed out at the national meeting, limited knowledge on what kind of systems we should build and part of the reason, is we have limited information on the impact of successful change efforts. If you have a system of building grants, one of the things you want to look at is measures of systems change. Finally, ECCS encompasses a broad range of efforts. Many [inaudible] some of these individual initiatives may have their own evaluation component. And hopefully with money set aside for that purpose. And these efforts can be integrated into your overall plan. It's part of your overall system of building results.

On the next slide, there's another resource and I want to talk about, Mark Friedman's approach to indicators, and I have a website there. Mark Friedman some of you may recall that we arranged for Mark to present at a workshop, I believe it was either the year that the project started or even a little before the first was due. And Mark presented and one of the things he uses in his presentation is on the next slide, and it's a picture he uses to illustrate getting from talk to action. And I think it's a very useful tool for helping program people think and talk about data. It shows the population we are looking at, and it -- Mark, it encourages folks to state the results you want to achieve in plain English, and it suggests we think about a few indicators that measure whether this result is being achieved. One of the things that Mark is a big proponent of, sticking to a limited number of indicators. You really want to figure out which indicators really most clearly tell the story that you want to tell. You may have some other ones, appendices and other places, but the reality is if you throw 100 indicators at people, they are not going to be getting exactly what it is you are trying to achieve as well as if you do a smaller set of well-selected indicators.

Another part of the, if you look next to the indicators, something called baseline. And what that is, is it's just showing data over time. One of the key insight, should not just show one year of data. One of the best ways to provide context is by showing trends over time. Mark suggests even using some projections into the future. I think certainly using past data is crucial. I think there's some interesting discussion as to whether you want to show projection. One thing you show, definitely to show things over time. You should then be

able to tell a story what is going on with the data and what you need to either continue making progress if things are going in the direction you want them to be going in, or ways you can turn the curb, as Mark Friedman puts it and from a negative to a positive trend. Who needs to play a role in what we know about what work, and it could be used to develop an action plan and budget for making good things happen. One of the, a federal agency which some of the ideas and their performance indicators, actually the part C agencies are asked to report performance indicators over time, and asked them to describe what is happening and agencies, ask agencies to describe what is happening and what they plan to do to fix any problems.

If you have ever read one of these, they are useful ways of understanding what's going on in the part C agency and what they are trying to change. For those folks who are listening who have to fill out these reports, I will add that the part C agencies do not limit the number of indicators. They feel there are too many indicators they have to report on. So I know that, because that's the one thing that makes people uneasy. But I think the idea reporting over time, being able to tell a story about it, being able to tell how you plan on making things better, it's a great idea. I use this slide in a presentation I did in Colorado when I was in an audience mainly of county folk, and the county people were, there was a great deal of interest and a great deal of demand for copies of it. It really did help them understand a good way of talking about data and presenting data. Some people had not thought of it before. Sometimes I think we think data and the use of data is intuitive, but I don't think it really is. And a tool like this can help you think about how you want to present information and what you want to say. The next slide, there's another resource, that's --

pathways mapping initiative. Established in January 2000. It is an initiative effort led by Elizabeth Shore, and she's also another key proponent of the need to focus on results, and what we want to achieve through systems building and early childhood.

And if you go to the next slide, there's another website, and if you go to that particular web page and point to assessing progress, you will see, you will -- and roll over it, you don't have to click on it, you just roll over it, you'll see three headings, using indicators, using community scan, and working with evaluators. And I think there is interesting material on this website in general. One of the common issues we find with evaluation plans for initiatives like ECCS, often times the grantees and the evaluators, the evaluators write an evaluation to meet the federal requirements but it's clear it was not designed to inform the initiative. And an arm's length between the evaluators and the grantees. I think you want -- you want regular communication with your evaluators and shape what the evaporation plan looks like so you can use what they find to use in the initiative. Interesting things. They have a list of indicators, and they are the first to admit on pathways, they are not the beat all and end it all of early childhood indicators, but they have selected a reasonable number and some that are very interesting, and they discuss using community stands for folks using community level building initiatives.

I talked a little about the difficulties in measuring systems change, and go to the next slide. Talk about a few resources in that regard. I don't think there's clearly a gold standard answer to how to do it. Often times it's done through qualitative evaluation, and I'm a good, great believer in good qualitative evaluations, also a firm believer they are not done

as well as they should be and they are more challenging to carry out than people realize. Sometimes people do focus groups and throw together three questions, and often times, to do did a really good qualitative evaluation takes a whole lot of energy and effort. Using surveys -- more quantitative method, I thought would share with you, the first five. They have surveys targeting a number of different respondents, county directors, and program participants. If you are familiar with first and five, it's funded through tobacco tax in California, and it provides a significant sum of money to counties to do early childhood systems building activities, and they are trying to measure how successful those are. Very interesting systems change members there. Lewin minimum data set survey, also some, and it will be interesting to see once they are implemented. We would love to hear about you from ways you are trying to measure systems change and I think it would be great if grantees shared ideas in this area.

Talk a little about possible T.A. needs. Just -- okay. We have done some work around evaluation issues as part of the T.A. efforts and wanted to share some examples of ways we might help you address T.A. needs in this area. As, and one of the things that I left off but then I realized as I was coming over here, I should have put on, helping, is developing logic models or modifying the logic model Lewin gave you to help you with evaluation. Certainly developing indicators or building support for indicators, a lot of folks have come up with a list of indicators, one of the things they want to try and establish is to try to get every agency or different agency from the state using them, talking about them, and being able to do essentially that story about here is what, here is what we are trying to change, here is what we are going to do and why they think it's going to change it. Presenting

indicators, developing community, assessing feasibility of evaluation strategy, usefulness of evaluation strategy, I think it's successful when you are about to undertake some evaluation activities that you really ask yourself, what are we going to know that we don't know now, and I think if you do that, you might say that sounded like a great idea to map every early childhood service in the state but it's going to take a whole lot of work and I'm not sure what we are going to be able to do when we are done with it. Maybe we should try something a little different. I think those are the very important questions to ask.

Just a reminder, if, if you are calling to kind of discuss ideas regarding evaluation or ask some basic questions, feel free to contact me directly. If it's a bigger T.A. request, a desire to convene a meeting around indicators or measuring the success, you have to take that request to the state project office. Finally, I just want to encourage everyone to share what works for you with other states. And we are increasingly hearing about grantees sharing experiences or resources with each other, and there have been some good examples of this taking place on the listserv. Do so with evaluation ideas, if you think it would be broadly helpful. If you are either reluctant to do that or think it might be something that is more narrow for a smaller number of states, you are also welcome to send material to us so we can share information when relevant questions come up, and also by sharing materials and information at the next national meeting, which will be in September. We are involved with planning that meeting now, and one of the key goals of the planning committee, which includes multiple grantees, is to use the next meeting to create opportunities for dialogue among grantees.

Most of you have been engaged in this effort for almost three full years now and many have achieved remarkable things using the ECCS as a resource and other things that you have put together. Sharing lessons learned and resources is an important way to help everyone move forward. And in the interest of kind of sharing things, next month the call will be on April 26, the same time as this one, and we'll feature two states, Indiana and Washington, and how they are using data to measure the success of their initiatives. And so thank you very much, and back to you, Dena.

DENA GREEN: Now we are going to take questions. And [inaudible]

JOE ZOGBY: First question is from Lorraine. For those who are still planning and developing a logic model, may we access samples of logic models developed for the 20 grantees? Chris, I sent them to you. Would you be able to put them on the, send them to Colorado and have them put up on the website?

CHRIS BOTSKO: We can certainly send them to folks. I guess, I mean, we could probably also put them on the temporary website until we get the initiative website up.

DENA GREEN: [Inaudible]

JOE ZOGBY: If they want to look at them, you know.

CHRIS BOTSKO: I will put -- I will see about putting the logic models up, I will send out the exact web page, but similar to the web page where the state plans currently are.

JOE ZOGBY: Rachel Hudson has submitted a question. Can we please post or repost the list of 20 grantees participating in the evaluation, and this would be this year, and what is the role of states not on the list? Jennifer.

JENNIFER KUO: Sure. I have the list of the 20. I can say what they are, which states they are now. If that's okay with you.

JOE ZOGBY: I -- yes, go ahead.

JENNIFER KUO: Okay. Pull that up here. 20 states involved in this year's evaluation, awarded in 2005, include Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Washington State. I mentioned before the grantees award in 2006 will be part of the year two national evaluation.

DENA GREEN: Second part of that question was how many of them did not, out of the 20 states did not get logic models. We developed 17 but plan to develop logic model for the other three.

JENNIFER KUO: Yes, we will be doing that in the next couple of months so they will be receiving those.

JOE ZOGBY: I want to add in the second year of the evaluation that all states this enter implementation by the beginning of the next year, will be included in the evaluation and there will be logic models and grantee profiles developed for you. That will take us up to all but the last three grantees that just applied last year for beginning the planning grant. When I say it will include all but those last three, we are including up to the full 50 in the evaluation, but you will have to be an implementation status at the beginning of the year in order to be included, because there will not be enough time to do an evaluation of you, unless you're at implementation status. That is by September 1st of 2006. Okay. We have another question from Rachel Hudson. How will you be measuring the number of children with the medical home?

JENNIFER KUO: That is one of the questions currently in the draft, minimum data set survey. As Alicia mentioned earlier, we are in the process of pilot testing the draft survey to be sure that the grantees have that information available or to help them identify data sources to identify that information. The intent of the minimum data set is to try to gather quantitative data on the initiative, and we did want to cover information that would relate to requirements that are in the implementation grant guidance. One of those requirements is the progress in the five critical component area, and one is looking at access to health insurance, and so adding the question is, was, adding that question into the survey was an attempt to quantitatively assess progress in that particular area. Washington is one of

the states, one of the indicators they do plan to track over time, and so perhaps with the next webcast speak about the indicators they are using they can give the other grantees ideas on what data sources to be looking at.

JOE ZOGBY: We have another question now from Kate Roper. Can you provide a link to the draft survey on the federal registry?

JENNIFER KUO: I can tell you what volume and number it's currently in the federal register. I guess we could provide a link somewhere, perhaps the same pose –

CHRIS BOTSKO: Post it on the listserv.

>> Okay.

JENNIFER KUO: Just to let you guys know -- it is, it was posted on Thursday, March 2nd, volume 71, number 41 on page 10695.
As Chris said, we will post a link to it.

JOE ZOGBY: Okay. Now we have something which is not a question, but we'll call it a request. Kay Johnson asked if we would mention the results for kids project, which she designed for San Diego using the Friedman tool. Now Kay is affiliated with our policy setter in Columbia, and perhaps we could get more information from Kay about that, and we could put it on the website, or up on the listserv, whichever would work better. Kay had

also asked if we would mention project -- policy tracking. It's our policy cooperative agreement. They are providing technical assistance, mostly directly to us at the program here, but some of that material is being shared with the grantees. Bethany Moore has asked how will the data from the minimum data set survey be used at the federal level and when will the survey be due?

JENNIFER KUO: As Alicia mentioned, we do plan to, once we are completed with the pilot testing and get clearance, we open to administer the survey in August and September of this year. The data, we will aggregate the data, synthesize it, identify common themes we will use to integrate and that we will be writing for the bureau in the fall of this year.

CHRIS BOTSKO: Just -- just so clarify something, and Joe said that there would be, that if you didn't get implementation plan by a certain point that you wouldn't be able to be evaluated. Just to clarify something, the Lewin is not an evaluation of individual grantees. It's not going to be used to determine your success. Really is an evaluation of the initiative as a whole, I understand it, and that is how the Maternal and Child Health is going to use it to show the overall success of the initiative.

JENNIFER KUO: We'll be aggregating the information, but we need to have information from the grantees in order to evaluate at a national level, but it will be an aggregate format and used to form the final evaluation report.

JOE ZOGBY: We have another comment. Kay Johnson would like us to mention that project pride, again which is our policy center at Columbia University, will be tracking and monitoring policy change. Project Thrive also developing finance summaries that are a good fit with the logic model which has been provided by Lewin. Okay. Another comment from Kay Johnson. Show notes with respect to the results for kids project, funded by the California endowment for San Diego, it is a model project for using Friedman with respect to turning the curb approach and engaging communities. Okay. And that's the end of the questions. If you have any more, you better get them in real fast. Okay. Do not sign off, please. Evaluation will appear shortly.

DENA GREEN: Meanwhile, I'll remind folks that our next session will be on April 26th at this same time, and at that time we'll have two of our states, and Christopher talking about some of the data that you might be collecting or need to collect for your own evaluation and this program. Thank you so much for joining us. And don't forget to fill out your evaluation forms.