Minutes

Wisconsin Partnership Program
Lifecourse Initiative for Healthy Families Evaluation Workgroup Committee
Wednesday, August 11, 2010 1:45 PM

Present: Phil Farrell; Ron Cisler; Angie Rohan; Vivian Jackson; Samantha Perry; Quinton Cotton; Georgia Cameron; Pat McManus; Marion Fass; Angela Moore; Julie Whelan Capell; Nancy Eberle; Paul Moberg; Patrice Onheiber; Courtenay Kessler; Jessica Rice; Sheila DeForest (phone)

Staff: Cathy Frey (phone), Lorraine Lathen, Eileen Smith, Tonya Mathison

1. Welcome & review of agenda

Phil Farrell called the meeting to order at 1:55 pm and invited members to introduce themselves.

Farrell provided an overview of the evaluation workgroup purpose and charge. He emphasized the need for a quality evaluation that is consistent among the four communities, but also recognizes the uniqueness of each community.

2. Review of evaluation activities and role of Evaluation Workgroup during the Community Action Planning Phase

Paul Moberg described that the evaluation will occur on multiple levels, including the impact of the LIHF project as a whole on intermediate and long-term outcomes and of individual projects undertaken by LIHF coalitions. The Evaluation Workgroup will help to plan, oversee, and review results and assure that each Collaborative is committed to the evaluation process. The Evaluation Workgroup should agree on the evaluation’s critical outcomes, process measures and evaluation tools across sites. The goal for Evaluation Workgroup is to establish appropriate, useful, consistent and scientifically sound outcome and process evaluation for both the planning and implementation phases.

During the Community Action Planning Phase, evaluation activities will focus on two areas. The first is laying the foundation for outcome and process evaluation that include the following activities:

- Assist the Collaboratives to develop clear goals and specific, measurable objectives for their Community Action Plans
- Ensure that appropriate data systems exist or can be created to assess program outcomes on target population (geographic, race and gender):
  - PRAMS-like survey of new mothers
  - Vital Statistics
  - Others to be determined (include intermediate outcomes)
Develop a comprehensive evaluation plan for the Implementation Phase
Coordinate collection of baseline data across all four LIHF communities

The second area is to document and assess the Community Action Planning process that includes the following activities:

- Document attendance and participation by individuals and organizations in meetings and events
- Measure changes in the number and quality of relationships between coalition participants with the Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory
- Jointly develop a community needs assessment to assess MCH resources and service gaps. (Draft tool to help look at programs, policies, environment and assets contributing to Lu’s 12 lifecourse strategies to close the black-white gap in birth outcomes.)

3. Community Needs Assessment tool

Paul Moberg and Nancy Eberle introduced a draft community needs assessment tool. The tool seeks to identify critical elements of a service delivery system. It then asked key informants the extent to which the system is meeting total populations needs with respect to element, effectiveness and quality and provides a mechanism to score service delivery based on that input. The tool asks communities to take each domain of the Lu 12-point plan in three groupings; access to care set, family strengthening, and allostatic load. It then focuses on coverage and accessibility, quality, coordination, duplication. The tool will provide baseline data on community perception of available programs and services.

There was a general agreement in support of the tool with suggested modifications. Lathen recommended that each collation should have active participation of individuals from impacted communities. Members expressed concerns with capacity, data collection and technical assistance needs. Moberg and Eberle will revise the tool, request feedback and submit for discussion at the next meeting.


Lathen presented for discussion three process evaluation tools for the Community Action Planning phase:

- A sign-in sheet for each LIHF Collaborative meeting listing types of representation across different sectors
- A monthly LIHF Collaborative meeting evaluation tool
- The Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory - Eberle-presented outcomes from three communities that have completed the inventory. The response rate was good; shows the degree to which communities rated similarly and if there was agreement across communities.
5. **Initial discussion of cross-site baseline outcome measures**

This agenda item was deferred to the next meeting.

6. **Reporting Progress to OAC, including data analysis**

Farrell stated that the Evaluation Workgroup must report to OAC and the Steering Committee on a regular basis. He expressed appreciation for the member’s progress to date, good attendance and aim to have excellent evaluation.

7. **Next meeting date/time**

The WPP staff will poll the members to determine the best time for a future meeting.

Adjourn at 3:35pm.