



# KALEIDOSCOPE

New Perspectives in  
Service Coordination  
LEVEL I

## Introduction

The Partnership for People with Disabilities offered the *New Perspectives in Service Coordination - Level 1 Training* to case managers and service coordinators. The training was held on June 23, 24 and July 23, 2003, in Fredericksburg, VA. This evaluation report will cover the evaluation of the training conducted at that time.

## Instrument

One instrument was used to evaluate participants' satisfaction with the conference. Besides demographic information, participants were asked about their overall satisfaction with the training, the knowledge of the presenters, pre and mid training activities, usefulness of training content, pre and post test questions, convenience of location, satisfaction with food, and comfort of the environment. Participants were also asked if they would be making changes to their practice as a result of the training.

## Participant Demographics

Twenty-three participants completed the evaluation form on the first day of training and eighteen completed an evaluation form after attending days 2 and 3. The majority of participants were Dedicated E.I. Service Coordinators (32%, n=7) and Primary Case Managers (32%, n=7). This was followed by Targeted Case Managers (18%, n=4), "other" (14%, n=3) and Case Manager Across Disciplines (5%, n=1). The "other" category consisted of participants with the following titles: Collaborating Agency, Council Coordinator, and Temporary Services Coordinator.

The majority of participants reported to be working full time (80%, n=16). The average caseload for full-time employment was 28 families. The majority of participants worked in the Northern (26%, n=6) and Southside (26%, n=6) regions of Virginia. Followed by the regions of Richmond Central (17%, n=4), Tidewater (17%, n=4), and Southwest (13%, n=3). Most participants reported to work in a rural community (57%, n=13). Twenty-six percent (n=6) of participants reported to work in a suburban community and seventeen percent (n=4) reported to work in an urban community. As a group, the majority of participants (61%, n=14) reported to have worked less than a year in either Early Intervention or Service Coordination. As a group, those who had worked for more than a year had worked an average of 4.3 years in Early Intervention and 4.2 years in Service Coordination.

## Satisfaction with Training

A review of table 1 shows that the majority of participants "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that pre-training and mid-training activities were helpful. The majority of participants also "strongly agreed" that the trainers were knowledgeable for all three

days of training. All participants either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the content for the entire training was useful. Pre and post- test questions were well received with all participants either “strongly agreeing” or “agreeing” that the questions were sufficiently covered in the content of the training.

For day 1, the majority of participants reported that they “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” that the food was satisfactory. However, there seemed to be slight improvement with the food served on days 2 and 3 with the majority of participants “strongly agreeing” that the food was satisfactory. Regarding the environment, the majority of participants “agreed” that the environment was comfortable for all days of the training and the majority of participants “agreed” that the location of the training was convenient.

**Table 1. Satisfaction with Training**

Questions	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Disagree 3	Strongly Disagree 4
The pre-training activities were helpful (day 1)	17% (n=4)	78% (n=18)	4% (n=1)	0
The mid-training activities were helpful (day 2/3)	39% (n=7)	61% (n=11)	0	0
The trainers were knowledgeable and prepared (day 1)	87% (n=20)	13% (n=3)	0	0
The trainers were knowledgeable and prepared (days 2/3)	83% (n=15)	17% (n=3)	0	0
The content was useful (day 1)	65% (n=15)	35% (n=8)	0	0
The content was useful (day 2/3)	61% (n=11)	39% (n=7)	0	0
The pre and post test questions were sufficiently covered in the content of the training (day 1)	25% (n=5)	75% (n=15)	0	0
The pre and post test questions were sufficiently covered in the content of the training (day 2/3)	44% (n=8)	56% (n=10)	0	0
The food was satisfactory (day 1)	4% (n=1)	13% (n=3)	48% (n=11)	35% (n=8)
The food was satisfactory (day 2/3)	44% (n=8)	28% (n=5)	28% (n=5)	0
The environment was comfortable (day 1)	22% (n=5)	65% (n=15)	13% (n=3)	0
The environment was comfortable (day 2/3)	6% (n=1)	61% (n=11)	33% (n=6)	0
The location was convenient	22% (n=5)	65% (n=15)	9% (n=2)	4% (n=1)

### Pre-training Activities

Participants were asked one open-ended question regarding what was most and least useful about the pre-training activities. The most useful pre-training activity was the use of the website (cited 8x). Other activities that were mentioned were learning more information about Early Intervention (cited 3x) and Service Coordination (2x). One participant commented that the activities were useful because “I did not just show up – was thinking about training before I got to training.”

The comments regarding the least useful pre-training activity was more mixed. Cultural competency was cited 2x as not being useful and two participants were not

specific and commented that “some information on the website was not useful.” Two participants commented that they had too little time to complete the activities before the training (one had received the material two days before the training began) and two participants commented that *everything* was useful.

### **Mid-training Activities**

Participants were asked one open-ended question regarding what was most and least useful about the mid-training activities. Two of the most useful mid-training activities were finding out about and participating in an LICC meeting (cited 5x) and learning about ability to pay (cited 4x). The least useful mid-training activities was the hat activity (cited 4x), however, four participants also cited that “all information was useful.” Two participants commented that the ability to pay section was confusing and one suggested the following: “I think the financial document needs to be refined so that the annual salary – divided by 12 after tax accurately reflects the net income – example would then come closer to sliding scale fee and also the way family would get net income monthly.”

### **Changes in Practice**

Participants were asked one open-ended questions regarding their plans to make changes in their practice as a result of the training. After day 1 of the training, participants reported that they planned to develop better IFSPs (cited 11x) and improve in how they approach parents and conduct the family interview (cited 3x) In addition participants reported that they would be more aware of their role as a service coordinator (cited 3x).

After days 2 and 3 of the training, participants reported that they planned to improve their transition planning (cited 7x) and IFSP planning for families (cited 6x). Participants also commented that they now have a better understanding of their role as service coordinators (cited 3x) and that they are intending to be more sensitive to families needs and approaching parents as “experts” (cited 2x).

### **Pre and Post Test Questions**

One open ended question asked participants for overall comments about the pre and post test questions. The majority of comments were positive. Participants reported that it was a good way to gage what they might not know and that it helped prepare them for what to learn in the training. The following are examples of participant’s statements:

“The pretest questions raised my awareness of what I should know and what I need to learn.”

“I believe the pretest questions were a good idea and helped me look out for answers throughout the training.”

“Very helpful to track and identify what I learned over the 3 day training.”

Only two participants offered suggestions for improving the tests questions. One stated that the questions were confusing and might be improved by using more true

and false questions. The other participant stated that several questions seemed oriented toward Part C jargon or former jargon rather than actual practice.

### **Overall Comments About the Training**

One open-ended question asked participants for overall comments of the training. All comments for the three days of training were combined. The vast majority of comments were very positive. Participants reported that the training was useful and enjoyable and that the trainers were knowledgeable, skillful, and experienced. The following are examples of some of the participant's statements:

"Great! Useful info. Very pertinent to daily job skills. The trainers were extremely helpful in answering questions. Very nice to have trainers who have so much experience in doing what we do."

"Great! I thoroughly enjoyed the format of presentation and organization of materials. The activities were appropriate and provided necessary and educational breaks."

"I enjoyed this training. I found it extremely useful and appreciated the patience of the trainers to answer endless questions. I found the activity very creative and meaningful. All of you did a wonderful job!!"

"I am pleased that you all are willing to pick up where we left off from day 2 at day 3 training and not rushed."

"Training was helpful and it helped to know that there are other professionals dealing with Part C."

"Much needed information new and updated. Would like to review as a training again to reiterate as well as review new and updated information."

"Excellent – very good quality. Awesome information provided. Presenters were extremely helpful and informed. Great at being able to assimilate information and/or questions into real day activities and what we are doing out in the field."

"Most useful training I've been to – some practical things to implement."

"Great. Should be required. Would like a take home list of participants' names and email addresses to network with."

Some participants also had suggestions for improving the training. The following suggestions were each mentioned one time: provide a resource book, provide more activities and less lecture on day 3; provide more time to actually practice goal writing by using IFSP forms, flow charts and goal pages; move the IFSP section to the first of the day when they are better able to take in the information; and have trainers tell participants what to write as outcomes so they have an idea what the aim for because it is difficult to come up with ideas when they are used to doing it another way. In addition, some participants suggested that Level 1 training might be better for Service Coordinators who have worked for 3 months and that new

employees should have some knowledge of Service Coordination and the forms before they attend. However, another participant reported that the training seemed more basic than they anticipated.