Purpose

- Outline the main components of the Children’s Bureau’s evaluation plan
- Highlight NRCPFC specific evaluation activities
- Explore the consultants role in evaluation activities
Cross-Site Evaluation

National Cross-Site Evaluation of all NRC’s and IC’s conducted by James Bell and Associates to assess

- Effectiveness of NRCs’ and ICs’ activities and service provision

- The relation of IC and NRC T/TA activities to systems change in State and Tribal child welfare systems

- The associated costs of the ICs and NRCs in achieving systems change outcomes

- The integration and cohesion of the T/TA network as a whole
Site Specific Evaluation Domains

- **Fit** - To what extent was T/TA individualized or tailored to the needs of States and Tribes served?
- **Scope** - How comprehensive is NRC’s knowledge and resources in its area of topical expertise?
- **Effectiveness** - How effectively did the NRC’s T/TA meet the needs of the State and Tribe?
Site Specific Evaluation Domains

- Quality Assurance - What was the quality of the T/TA provided?
  - What was the quality of the consultation provided by individual NRC employees and contracted consultants?
  - What was the quality of the products created?
- Evidence-Based Practice - How effective was NRC in collecting and disseminating information about evidence-based and promising practices in its areas of child welfare expertise?
Site Specific Evaluation Domains

- **Comprehensive Assessment & Responsiveness**
  - How well did NRC assess the needs of its client? Were other T/TA Network members or other resources involved, as necessary?

- **Communication**
  - How effectively did the NRC share info about the process and the results of providing T/TA?
  - Did feedback help inform future decisions about T/TA?
Site Specific Evaluation Domains

- **Collaboration** -
  - How effectively did NRC collaborate with other T/TA Network members when providing T/TA?
  - How well did NRCs collaborate across their evaluation activities?

- **Implementation & Improvement** -
  - How effective was NRC in helping States and Tribes implement steps in their plans for corrective action and systemic change?
  - How effective was NRC in helping systems improve their performance in response to federal requirements?
Site Specific Evaluation Domains

- Principles -
  - To what degree did NRC adhere to SOC and CFSR principles?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge and expertise of consultants that provided TA</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The consultants were knowledgeable about [Area of Need].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The consultants effectively utilized the knowledge and expertise of our State or Tribe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The consultants were able to build a positive working relationship with our staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The consultants effectively facilitated conversations with our staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. The consultants effectively facilitated the process and work necessary to address our need or problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. The consultants were able to understand the State or Tribe's unique situation and tailor the technical assistance to our needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Overall, the consultants were effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome of the T/TA event</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. The T/TA event addressed our State's or Tribe's needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. The [IC/NRC Name] provided our State or Tribe with a viable plan for implementing the recommended strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. The T/TA event increased our State's or Tribe's knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. The T/TA event increased our State's or Tribe's skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. The T/TA event improved our State's or Tribe's service capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. The T/TA event improved our State's or Tribe's ability to better serve children, youth, and families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with communication, information sharing, relationships, and follow through</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Our State or Tribe was satisfied with the level of accessibility of the [NRC/IC Name].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Our State or Tribe was satisfied with the frequency of communication with the [NRC/IC Name].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Our State or Tribe felt comfortable disclosing our areas of concern or weaknesses to [NRC/IC Name].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Our State or Tribe played an active part in decision making regarding the course of action to be taken by the [NRC/IC Name].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Overall, our State or Tribe was satisfied with the relationship that was been developed with [NRC/IC Name].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NRCPFC Short-Term Outcomes

- Increase awareness of CW professionals of evidence-based practices and new research initiatives
- Maximize NRCPFC’s responsiveness to the needs of the States, Tribes, and Territories
- Improve the “One T/TA Network” Approach
- T/TA participants increase understanding of key concepts of permanency and family connections
NRCPFC Intermediate Outcomes

- Create positive change in service delivery to children, youth, and families
- Implementation of policy changes to improve permanency and family connections
- Fully coordinate T/TA Planning and Delivery
- Transfer of Learning sustained 6-months post-T/TA
NRCPFC Long-Term Outcomes

- Improved outcomes for children, youth, and families in safety, permanency, and well-being

- Successful “One T/TA Network” Approach
Strategies

- Surveys -
  - Transfer of Learning Knowledge Surveys
  - Customer Satisfaction Survey
  - Online Information Services Feedback Survey

- Focus groups and telephone interviews -
  - assess changes in practice and policies as a result of T/TA

- Content analysis -
  - T/TA activity survey, meeting attendance logs, policy documents, PIP plans and CFSR assessment scores
Consultants Role

- Asked to distribute the transfer of learning assessment survey before and after T/TA activities
- Asked to distribute customer satisfaction feedback surveys
- May be asked to provide information to James Bell and Associates for the Cross-Site evaluation