



Research & Evaluation Work Group
June 3, 2010, 1 pm – 3 pm
Meeting Minutes

Attendance: Marc Mackert (ARD), Anne Comstock (MPCWIC), David Bellamy (CDHS), Bill Madura (CDHS), Ki'i Powell (CDHS), Julie Morales (MPCWIC), Anna de Guzman (MPCWIC)

I. Review R&E Work Group Charter

- The updated Charter is a compilation of comments that were submitted by group members from the first discussion of the Charter on 4/22/10.
- Group agreed on most comments submitted by group members. Each section was discussed in turn by the group and highlights of discussion follow:
 - I – Scope, objectives and expected outcomes
 - Each work group has a draft objective sheet. There will be more clarification as time goes by.
 - Group agreement that there needs to be a mechanism for communicating with other work groups (including sharing documents). Group members shared different ideas of online workspaces. Julie will follow up with Butler team and return examples of shared online workspaces to the Group at next meeting.
 - Group agrees that each WG should use same templates, for example, for meeting minutes. Communication WG is working on these templates. Logo has been created for the project and will be used on documents.
 - II – Membership and term
 - Group should look into having county program people in the R&E WG as well, not just having all data people in its membership.
 - Group agrees that we should look into bringing in speakers/experts to our meetings occasionally, which would not be as huge a commitment as joining the WG.
 - Ki'i's recommends bringing in ground level people to our meetings when we start talking about our evaluation plan. After group discussed options of how to contact county program people, Ki'i will ask Lloyd about a ground level participant for our group and to talk to CSSDA (Colorado Social Services Directors Association) about it.
 - III – Leadership, roles and functions
 - WG Chair is Julie. There was group discussion about having a co-chair to represent CDHS and with the view that MPCWIC will eventually leave the project. However, because the objective of the R&E WG is to do an external evaluation of the CPI, this WG will also go away eventually. The capacity building being done by this WG will continue with the Performance Management WG.
 - Member functions will definitely include homework, which will be similar to the email exchanges and feedback done with finalizing the PM survey.
 - IV – Boundaries, limitations, authority and accountability
 - Group discussed data permission, for example the process we just went through with planning the PM survey. There needs to be full understanding about how to follow appropriate protocols and gaining appropriate permissions, etc., as we continue to do our work.

- Group agrees that we have some clearly articulated connection to POIT. Anne shared that other WGs have already defined this process and will share with Julie.
 - V – Decision making processes
 - After much discussion, Julie will look at POIT conversation around consensus (what does consensus mean? What to do when there's a stalemate?) and will include it in our Charter.
 - Group also agreed that there were not enough members to make a final decision on consensus versus majority. Conversation will continue at next meeting.
 - VI – Values and way of work (ground rules)
 - Group agreed that all members should have a designated substitute. Name and email should be given to Anna to add to group email list.
 - Group agreed that when the agenda is emailed out, people will respond with their attendance, yes or no or if a designated substitute will be attending instead.
- Charter will be revised based on discussion today and Group will return to it at next meeting.

II. Update on the Practice Model Survey

- We have approval from CSSDA. Once DU's IRB gives their approval, Julie will inform Ki'i that survey emails can be sent.
- Group agreed to let County Directors (CD) send email out, per agreement with CSSDA. We will not send survey emails through other listservs.
- Group agreed to ask CDs to have Julie copied in the email when they disseminate the survey. Julie/Anna will use this as a way to track response rate by county (which counties sent email out to their staff and when). Reminders to CDs for them to send the survey link will be done after a few days (if they did not copy Julie on their emails).
- Dave B. will hold on to the email distribution lists that he has been collecting from CDs. This WG or another one may need it later in the project.
- New project logo will be added to the survey.
- Anne will check with Caitlin re: project website and whether we will include a link to the website on the End of Survey message.

III. Review Drivers by Stages Grid

- Reviewed as part of next agenda item.

IV. Evaluation Logic Model Development

- Group was asked to divide into 2 groups. Each group looked at a project WG (Communication and Practice Model Design & Development – PMDD) and was asked to write down items for each prompt in the Logic Model (LM) exercise – Responsibilities/Activities, Timeline, Communication, and Success.
- Group quickly came back together and instead brainstormed ideas of how we can facilitate other WGs to create their own LM, with the idea that we will then use their LMs to create an evaluation plan for the whole project. We can also create timelines out of this process, see how

WGs' timelines align together. With an evaluation plan and timelines, our WG can come up with our process for reporting back on the project.

- Currently active WGs are Communication, PM (starting on 6/21), and us. POIT is more of oversight group. Other WGs will come together after the work of PMDD WG.
- Group agreed that we will have to come up with our own LM before any members could go to other WGs and facilitate them through the process.
- Before next meeting, group members will look at 3 different examples of LMs (NIRN cascading model, ARD's model that is used by the counties, and a traditional LM from Julie that she created in February for CO's implementation project). Anna will email these examples and everyone will need to be prepared to discuss which tool is best to use for CPI.
- Group discussed other planning ideas for LM coaching/facilitation, including having 2 R&E WG members do each facilitation and agreeing that the facilitation work will need to be split up among all members, not the same team every time. Group will continue discussing how we will be coaching/facilitating other WGs through the LM process at next meeting.

V. Other

- Group discussed adding another meeting between June 24th and July 22nd meetings. Anna will send meeting wizard to group members to pick July 8 meeting time at 8 am or 3 pm.

Next meeting: June 24, 2010, from 1 pm to 3 pm
CDHS, 1575 Sherman Street, Room 9E