**SAFE START**
**NATIONAL EVALUATION MEETING**
**NEW ORLEANS, LA**
**MAY 12-13, 2005**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

## THURSDAY, MAY 12, 2005

### OPENING

David Chavis (ASDC) gave opening remarks regarding purpose and agenda for the National Evaluation Meeting.

### SITE PRESENTATIONS (FULL PRESENTATIONS AND MATERIALS WILL BE POSTED ON THE SAFE START EVALUATION WEB SITE WWW.CAPACITYBUILDING.NET)

**WASHINGTON COUNTY – BILL GODDARD**
- ➢ Presentation Title: *Reflecting on Practice* This presentation reviewed a range of evaluation practice models and recommended a "Development Evaluation" model.
- ➢ The Rapid Response team's screening tool (developed in the last 8 months) was discussed briefly. Data collected with this tool so far indicates that 87% of violence occurs in the home and 50% of children have witnessed the violent event.
- ➢ Emphasized the relationship between the evaluator and program staff

**SPOKANE – KATE BEHAN**
- ➢ Presentation Title: *Spokane County Children's Mental Health Family Violence Screening Pilot* This presentation reviewed findings from a study designed to establish rates of intimate partner violence exposure in families receiving publicly-funded mental health services.
- ➢ In the future the county will adopt the universal screening instrument, indicating a "huge" culture change in the mental health system.

**SITKA – PAUL SCHEWE**
- ➢ Presentation Title: *Sitka Safe Start Data Summary* This presentation summarized information about children and families served by CID COPS since January 1, 2004.
- ➢ CID COPS represents the first successful Native/Non-Native collaboration in Sitka. Reasons for the success of CID COPS was discussed briefly and included the fact that children's exposure to violence is a "shared issue" for both Native and Non-Native communities and the program offered an opportunity for "real two-way dialogue" as well as a tangible deliverable to the city.

**SAN FRANCISCO – RUTH WHITE**
- ➢ Presentation Title: *San Francisco SafeStart Results: Making a Difference in the Lives of Young Children Exposed to Domestic Violence* This presentation reviewed children's exposure to violence in San Francisco, characteristics of families served by SafeStart, and client outcomes.
- ➢ Data sources include admission forms, case management forms and referral information. The Family Resource Center Family Advocate gathers the information from families.
- ➢ A brief discussion took place about the location and utilization of the Family Resource Centers: families are seeking services outside of their neighborhood – perhaps to maintain their privacy, perhaps to find family advocates who speak their native language (language barrier to accessing services exists in San Francisco); it was observed that people initially came into the center to report community violence which opened the door for them to report domestic violence issues.

**ROCHESTER – DEBBIE JOHNSON AND RUSTI BERENT**
- ➢ Presentation Title: *Rochester Safe Start* This presentation focused on the importance of linking evaluation to the initiative and reviewed the ways in which Rochester has made this link.
- ➢ Phase II of the Shadow of Violence campaign was introduced.

**PINELLAS COUNTY – SANDRA ORTEGA**
- ➢ Presentation Title: *Pinellas Safe Start Evaluation Update* This presentation reviewed the evaluation framework components (system level, community level, and individual level) and findings to date at each level of analysis.
- ➢ Sandra presented a quality assurance issue to the group for discussion. She noticed inconsistencies between responses to open- and closed-ended questions – positive feedback was reported (by the same persons) in the open-ended sections whereas responses to the multiple choice questions provided negative feedback. Sandra wanted to know what folks thought about calling these respondents and asking about their interpretation of the questions (without changing the data) for quality assurance purposes. Several thought this would be appropriate.
- ➢ Data for the Pretest of the PSI is collected using the long form and the mid-test and Post-test use the short form. In order to compare the data across all three reporting periods, the items in the long form that are in the short form will be analyzed.

**CHICAGO – PAUL SCHEWE**
- ➢ Presentation Title: *Chicago Safe Start Data & Evaluation Report* This presentation reviewed data about trainings, identification and referral of children and families received by service providers and intervention outcome data.

**CHATHAM COUNTY –** JEANE-CLAUDE MOWANDZA-NDINGA
  ➢ Presentation Title: *Chatham County Safe Start Evaluation Status* This presentation reviewed the design and status for the: (1) community awareness and education campaign study, (2) community development and outreach efforts study, (3) system integration and collaboration study, and (4) direct services outcome study.

**BRIDGEPORT –** JOY KAUFMAN (BASED ON ANALYSIS BY TEAM MEMBERS)
  ➢ Presentation  Title: *Bridgeport Safe Start Initiative: Interagency Collaboration Survey & Social Network Analysis* This presentation described the demographic characteristics of participating agencies, network analysis of collaboration, barriers to and facilitators of collaboration identified by study participants, changes in the collaborative network, and the implications of the findings for the community.

**BALTIMORE –** DELORIS VAUGHN
  ➢ Presentation: An overview of Baltimore's evaluation activities was provided. Referrals to Safe Start Intervention Services have been slow but the evaluation expects to use data on all active clients to assess treatment outcomes.
  ➢ BCSSI designed a screening tool for the identification of children impacted by exposure to violence and conducted a validation study to validate the questions; the study was unsuccessful because of an insufficient number of participants. Nonetheless, the screening questions have been modified for use by agencies that agree to identify CEV.
  ➢ A Parent Resiliency Scale will be administered to participants in a parent resiliency group at the first and last group sessions.
  ➢ The Train-the-Trainer and the Early Childhood Mental Health Training Series have been well-attended in Baltimore and there are plans to expand them.

**DISCUSSION**: What information do you have at this stage of the project in regards to the prevalence/incidence of children exposed to violence in your community?

  ➢ Chicago estimates: There were "responses to 2,000 domestic violence incidents in each community". Since January of 2003, the police completed a total of 494 Chicago Safe Start referral cards in the 5th and 7th Districts. Dividing 494 by 4,000 (assuming the same time frame) - 12% of these incidents resulted in children exposed to violence.
  ➢ San Francisco estimates: 2003 Domestic Violence Response Unit data show that 919 children are exposed to violence each year. San Francisco

SafeStart estimates that almost 10,000 children are exposed to domestic violence each year in San Francisco alone.

➢ Spokane study findings: Among families (N = 152) receiving publicly-funded mental health services, 67% of caregivers reported they have been an intimate partner violence victim since their child was born. Among these caregivers, 92% reported their children lived in homes where the violence occurred and 85% reported their children were witnesses to the domestic violence. In 64% of the study's 152 families, the children enrolled for mental health services was a witness to the domestic violence.

➢ Washington County estimates: Data collected with the screening tool developed in the last 8 months and used by the Rapid Response team has generated the following statistics – 87% of violence occurs in the home, 50% of the children seen by the team witnessed a violent event.

## DISCUSSION: COMMUNITY OUTREACH

Various issues related to the role of natural settings in an initiative like Safe Start were discussed briefly during the meeting.

➢ During Rochester's presentation of the Shadow of Violence campaign, different goals for public campaigns were considered. Is the goal to increase referrals to the service delivery system? Is the goal to increase community capacity (e.g., every day citizens) to respond to violence?

➢ Also considered was the importance of engaging settings such as faith-based organizations and settlement houses as vehicles for reducing children's exposure to violence.

➢ Finally, the need for professional culture change within sectors such as mental health was discussed in the context of where families are more likely to seek help. Many sites have had difficulty engaging families in the mental health system. The concrete needs of families was underestimated by many and as it currently exists, the mental health system is not designed to address these barriers to service.

## NATIONAL SAFE START PROCESS EVALUATION PRESENTATION

➢ This presentation described the cross-site analysis and encompassed the methodology used for data analysis, systems change activities, and findings of systems change activities.

➢ Findings were reported on collaboration strengths and challenges, organizational and service provider capacities, cross-organizational capacities, sustainability of system change activities, and lessons learned (e.g. collaboration, Safe Start staff, and delivery).

- ➢ Conclusions centered on questions to be addressed by future evaluation activities:
  - o How can the knowledge base continue to expand to build the capacity of service providers to intervene appropriately?
  - o What are the special considerations for communities (e.g., rural, Native) with regard to interventions?
  - o How can promising interventions be adapted?
  - o What types of technical assistance and other resources do communities such as these need to support the adaptation of promising practices?
  - o What types of prevention and environmental strategies are most appropriate for creating supportive environments?
  - o What would it take to integrate these types of strategies into a local Safe Start Initiative?

## DISCUSSION: HOW DO WE EXPLAIN THE IDENTIFICATION, ASSESSMENT, AND REFERRAL DATA PATTERNS REPORTED BY EACH SITE?

Data inconsistencies in the process evaluation were explained by different pathways for providing services among sites. Data were further explained by the following demonstration sites:
- ➢ Bridgeport – The number of children identified and the number of children referred should be the same because they are defined synonymously and are part of the same step in the service pathway.
- ➢ Spokane – The number of children identified and the number of children referred should be the same number because they are defined synonymously and are also part of the same step in the service pathway – Kate will send more recent figures.
- ➢ Washington County – The number of children identified and the number of children referred should be the same. The families do not always follow through for the assessment to take place so assessment numbers are typically lower.
- ➢ Pinellas – different agencies report for different stages: the number of children identified (six agencies), number of children assessed (just one), and number of children referred (these numbers reflect referrals to partner agencies and referred from partner agencies, including to each other)

Suggestion: Define what the terms identified, assessed, and referred mean because sites vary in how they define these performance measures. Different pathways are used to serve children in the different sites.

## TIER II PRESENTATIONS

**ROCHESTER –** DEBBIE JOHNSON
  ➢ TESI is being used and they are waiting for more data collection to do the validity work on it. The violence scale was just added within the last 2-3 years out of the past 12 years of the data collection.

**BRIDGEPORT –** JOY KAUFMAN
  ➢ This presentation reviewed the methodology used to collect data using the TESI, PSI, and TSCYC. More data is needed to examine which families benefit most and the impact of dosage on outcomes.

**CHICAGO –** PAUL SCHEWE
  ➢ The goal is to determine the factors associated with outcomes using a regression model. Data from the "Completion of Services" forms by providers in 3 agencies has provided information on 72 families. Safe from the Start sites have promised data on 150 families. This information can still be completed after services because the therapist reports on the child and family.

**PINELLAS –** SANDRA ORTEGA
  ➢ This presentation reviewed the focus and plan for the evaluation. Tier II progress to date and next steps. To date, the Resiliency Matrix has bee developed and approved by partners, a Decision Tree is in the field, the PSI Long Form was converted to a Short Form, and database development and linkages are in progress..

**SAN FRANCISCO –** RUTH WHITE
  ➢ This presentation reviewed the purpose of the study and proposed research activities which encompass reviewing child welfare case files, dependency court case files, and the collection of information from domestic violence victims.

## DISCUSSION: HOW CAN WE COLLABORATE FURTHER THROUGH STUDIES, PRESENTATIONS, & PUBLICATIONS?

Collaboration (i.e., data sharing) is essential if we are going to make a contribution to the field about reducing the impact of exposure to violence and if we are going to maximize our collective learning about the impact of exposure to violence on children. From an intervention perspective we should be able to identify intervention protocols that are most appropriate in the populations we are working with.

ASDC committed to providing the following support and resources for collaboration:

- ➢ Convene meetings
- ➢ Provide an editor
- ➢ Conduct literature reviews – NCCEV is also available and willing to conduct searches
- ➢ Provide special expertise or technical assistance
- ➢ Pool data and create one database including a Master Coding Book – Joy volunteered her statistician for the analysis plan and site evaluators agreed to submit data if permissible
- ➢ Compile training materials  from across sites

Collaboration issues identified by the group include:

- ➢ Special Issue or Individual Papers
- ➢ Authorship
- ➢ Resources
- ➢ Audience (non-profit community, practitioners?) – determines the use of a publisher v. DOJ for dissemination of the product(s); Journals mentioned include the Journal of Non Profit Management, Journal of Interpersonal Violence, Journal of Family Violence
- ➢ Timeline
- ➢ IRB

## FRIDAY, MAY 13, 2005

## UPCOMING PRESENTATIONS AND MEETINGS

**AEA –** NOTIFICATION OF PANEL ACCEPTANCE EXPECTED IN JULY

**OJJDP –** Cross-site meeting
- ➢ June 16-17, 2005 in Washington, DC

**BRIDGEPORT –** Program Evaluation: Real World Challenges and Successes
- ➢ May 20, 2005 in New Haven, CT

Joy has an article accepted by American Journal of Community Psychology (Using Evaluation to Promote Community Change) and one on social networks submitted to the same journal.

**PINELLAS** – Pinellas Safe Start vendor table at Florida Association of Infant Mental Health

- June, 2005

Project Director co-presenting with local unified family court judge – "Coordinated Response to Children Exposed to Violence" – 68th Annual NCJFCJ Conference
- July 17-20, 2004 in Pittsburgh PA

Panel on Safe Start Project submitted to International Family Violence Conference – notice pending
- September 16-21

**ROCHESTER –** Shadow of Violence Conference
- Rochester, NY

## COLLABORATION DISCUSSION CONTINUED...

Several collaboration teams and topics were generated during this discussion. These teams will work on producing publishable articles on these topics. They are as follows:

- Does Training Work? (Rusti Berent, Deloris Vaughn, and Joy Kaufman) – develop and send out an instrument that includes a case for analysis – assess the analysis for competence acquired via the trainings.

- Practice Model for Evaluation/Project Relationship (Bill Goddard, Ruth White, Debbie Johnson, and Sandra Ortega) – what has been learned about the importance of this relationship and what parallel lessons were learned at the local level (local evaluator/project director) and at the national level (national team/local evaluators & project directors)?

- Increased Collaboration in the Service Delivery System – Social Network Analysis (Deb Johnson, Rusti Berent, Bill Goddard, Sandra Ortega, Joy Kaufman, George Cole)- compile social network data and assess system change from those evaluations using network analysis, if possible.

- What Characteristics Describe Children Exposed To Violence? (Joy Kaufman, John Shields, Sandra Ortega, Paul Schewe) – create a profile of these children from cross site data.

## SITE EVALUATION REPORT FORM (A COPY OF THE MOST CURRENT FORM WILL BE POSTED ON THE SAFE START EVALUATION WEB SITE WWW.CAPACITYBUILDING.NET)

The revised Site Evaluation Report Form was reviewed with meeting participants. The following questions and answers were discussed. ASDC will develop a FAQ for this form and distribute it via the listserv.

Q: Is Section 2 (Community Capacity) where we report how the Safe Start Initiative increased community capacity?
A: No, use this section to describe the community's non-Safe Start capacity to serve children exposed to violence. Section 8 (Increased Community Capacity) is where you report how the SSI has increased community capacity.

Q: Is Section 3 (Integrated Assistance) where we report local assistance provided BY Safe Start staff?
A: No, use this section to report local or national assistance received by or provided to Safe Start staff (or those involved in the Initiative). Local assistance provided BY Safe Start staff would be reported in Section 6 (System Change Activities)

Q: Does the National Technical Assistance Team track assistance give to the sites?
A: We are not aware of the system and they should be directly contacted.

Q: Do we include findings from the intervention research in Section 6 (System Change Activities)?
A: No, report these individual-level methods and outcomes in the Intervention Research Results Reporting form.

Q: What if we can't make causal attributions when responding to Sections 9 and 10 (Reduced Exposure to Violence and Reduced Impact of Exposure to Violence)?
A: Use the same rigorous attribution process and criteria you would use in your own reports according to standards commonly used in the social sciences. It's ok to leave these sections blank if there are no findings to report regarding reduced exposure.

## CROSS-SITE EVALUATION PROCESS

The Cross-Case Study Process was reviewed (articles and chapters provided to meeting participants as part of meeting binders). The Logic Model as the outline for the report and the cross case analysis. The case studies will include information from the Site Evaluation Report Forms. Data collected is reported

when verified by two or more sources. The Intervention Research Reporting was discussed. Data from these reports are also included in the case studies.

## ADDITIONAL DISCUSSIONS

What are the questions you have about the process evaluation and reports?

➢ Was there any analysis of the association between the lead agency ("home base" for the SSI) and staff turnover?

Process evaluation.

➢ Consider conducting focus groups during site visits with a core group of stakeholders (including consumers of services)

Site Evaluation Reporting Form (SERF)

➢ The SERF was difficult to work in – can it be made more user-friendly?

What would you like to see on the agenda at the cross-site meeting that would be most useful to you and maximize your expertise?

➢ Review the SERF with the Project Directors
➢ Present the cross-site Evaluation Process
➢ Present the cross-site Findings from 2004
➢ Review the Time Line of National Evaluation Activities through the end of the Contract period (send to Project Directors in advance)

Focus group of the core group in addition to individual interviews. Joy felt that this is needed because she doesn't always think of everything.

## THURSDAY, MAY 12, 2005 EVALUATION RESULTS

Table 1 illustrates respondents' usefulness ratings for Day 1 on the questionnaire developed to evaluate the meeting. Each session was rated on a five point Likert scale; 1 meaning "not useful", 3 "somewhat useful", and 5 "very useful." Participants, on average, rated one session, "Conference Presentations Check-In", to be somewhat useful". Meeting participants found 4 of the 5 sessions on Day 1 to be "useful".

Table 1: Day 1 Participant Ratings of Meeting Usefulness

| Meeting Session | Day 1 Meeting Usefulness | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | N | M |
| Site Evaluators Presentation and Discussion | 9 | 4.7 |
| National Safe Start Process Evaluation | 9 | 4.6 |
| Tier II Project Updates | 9 | 4.0 |
| Conference Presentations Check-in | 8 | 3.75 |
| Discussion on our Collaboration | 9 | 4.7 |

## FRIDAY, MAY 13, 2005 EVALUATION RESULTS

Table 2 illustrates respondents' usefulness ratings for Day 2 on the National Evaluation Meeting questionnaire. Each session was rated on a five point Likert scale; 1 meaning "not useful", 3 "somewhat useful", and 5 "very useful." Meeting participants, on average, found 4 of the 5 sessions on Day 2 to be "somewhat useful". One of the sessions, "Timeline of Activities", was rated as "useful".

Table 2: Day 2 Participant Ratings of Meeting Usefulness

| Meeting Session | Day 2 Meeting Usefulness | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | N | M |
| Overview of National Evaluation | 8 | 3.7 |
| Cross-Site Evaluation Process | 8 | 3.8 |
| Site Evaluation Report Form | 8 | 3.9 |
| Timeline of Activities | 8 | 4.0 |
| Remaining Questions & Issues | 6 | 3.0 |

In addition to rating the sessions, participants were also asked specific questions regarding the overall meeting.

The most useful aspects of the meeting identified by some respondents' were:
- The site presentations;
- Review of the site evaluation report form;
- Discussion of lessons learned;
- Publication collaboration and
- The cross-site evaluation.

Areas some respondents would like to have spent more time on included:
- Assigning authorship for publications and
- Discussing what site evaluators would do differently if given the opportunity.

A suggestion for gaining evaluators "permission" to collaborate prior to the next meeting, in order to delve further into publication planning was given. Small group breakouts were identified as missing in the meeting and some felt they would be useful to have group breakouts in future meetings in order to plan collaborative publications.

New knowledge and skills acquired by some respondents' at the meeting included methods for organizing and presenting numerical data from multiple sites and sources.

General comments include that the meeting was informative and well facilitated, planned, and organized. Furthermore, the groups' level of participation was viewed as encouraging and enjoyable.

Table 3 illustrates how satisfied respondents' were regarding additional aspects of the meeting. Each statement is in response to the question, "How satisfied were you with the following?" In addition to the topics listed in Table 3, camaraderie and internet access were identified as other areas of satisfaction. Respondents' that identified these additional areas were "very satisfied." Each aspect of the meeting was rated on a five point Likert scale; 1 meaning "very dissatisfied", 3 "neither satisfied or dissatisfied", and 5 "very satisfied." Meeting participants were "satisfied" with 3 of the 4 aspects of the meeting and one was "very satisfied" with the "food".

Table 3: Day 2 Participant Ratings of Meeting Satisfaction

|  | Day 2 Meeting Satisfaction | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Meeting Aspect** | N | M |
| Planning of the meeting | 8 | 3.9 |
| Communication about the meeting | 8 | 3.9 |
| Lodging | 8 | 3.9 |
| Food | 8 | 4.0 |