Evaluation Subcommittee Meeting

5/14/15

In Attendance: Dr. Gordon Hodas, Mark Durgin, Andy Kind-Rubin, Tim Truckenmiller

Two New Members Joined and Attended: Jessica Elam (youth partner from Delaware) and Melissa Bible (system partner from Erie)

Staff Support Attendance: Monica Walker Payne, Amanda Clouse

Standing Meeting will be the 2nd Thursday of the month from 9:00 to 10:30.

Meeting Start 9:04 am

Monica gave a brief overview of the Evaluation subcommittee and we gave introductions.

1. Finalize the How to Use Data Tip Sheet – (latest draft attached here.)
   a. Reviewed the County Data resources links on the PDF sheet.
   b. Reviewed the goal to have a county data item at the County Leadership Team meeting.
   c. Changes/modifications to the form.
      i. Comment-Dr. Hodas-What do youth, Family, provider and system partners look for. Under Youth-Youth Satisfaction change enjoyable to beneficial or helpful.
      ii. Page 1 needs a title to show that this is a process to look at data in a county leadership meeting.
      iii. Is it too long and reduce to 2 pages.
      iv. It was discussed to merge some of the lines to combine onto 2 pages.
         1. What data is meaningful merge first 2 bullets.
         2. Page 2 are they steps for number 4? No these are additional tips. This should be detailed out with new line. How to present Data in a Meaning full way??
            a. Monica will work with spacing and formatting.
2. Review a new "Data 101 – The Basics" Tip Sheet that we want to use for the Learning Institute Workshop but also put on the SOC website – (draft attached here.)
   a. Discussed that some persons don't fully understand data, and how to look at data due to not knowing the terms and how to understand data.
   b. Thoughts and feedback
      i. No matter how it is presented, some will embrace this and some will be intimidated by this.
      ii. **Data has its own language, it exists and there is no way around it –Could this be the tag line of this Data 101 Basics**
      iii. Mean- is the average, and this should be in the sentence, verse in the example. Median is the number above and below the middle.
      iv. Standard Deviation-Need a more detailed example.
      v. Correlation- The graphs are confusing. May be better to just detail correlation and have some examples
      vi. P value, Statistically significant, and Significance Level. Move p value first, and show the correlation to Statistically significant and significance level.
      vii. Box Cross-sectional and Longitudinal data.

3. Quick updates about the County Assessment survey participants and reports.
   a. This is officially closed.
   b. 370 forms were received. 190 in SOC counties and 180 in non SOC counties.
   c. 34 Counties will be receiving reports. 14 SOC Counties, and 20 other non SOC counties will get reports.
   d. The 370 Surveys that were scored had more than 50% of the questions completed.
   e. As long as they had two people per partner types the county will get a separate report.
   f. Issue- 45 paper surveys were received and with that there is submissions (25) were filled by what appears to be the same pen, and writing type, but the answers are not identical and there 42 where there was no county listed.
      i. It was discussed this could have been an interview type of survey.
      ii. 3 can be put in with the correct county, but no partner type.
      iii. Mark's comment was that this could not go into the county report.
      iv. Monica agreed can't go into county, but should it go into the State report?
      v. The issue is if this is included in the state report, it would equate for about 20% of the state report.
      vi. The main reason not to use it would be the lack of county and partner type.
         1. But on the online survey, some people did not put partner type, so should the online ones be excluded that don't have a partner type?
         2. Important to be consistent between paper and online forms.
         3. Also important to put clear rules in place so that this does not happen again.
         4. Amanda pointed out that data is always used in our interview data even if we have suspicion that it is not accurate.
         5. Group consensus leaned toward not using the data for the state report because too many unknowns and will have impact on the state data. However, the 3 surveys with a county identified could be used for the state report.

4. Reviewed the SOC Expansion Grant and Healthy Transitions Data Requirements. (Only the draft of the SOC tools here because they are identical).
   a. There is a Baseline Demographic and Descriptive Data Form and a DCI Interview Form that are the same across all SAMHSA grants now.
   b. Showed where on the website these data trainings and instruments can be located.
   c. Monica reviewed the counties that have been trained in each grant.
   d. Dr. Hodas suggested DCI be written out as Data Collection Instrument (DCI).
   e. Dr. Hodas suggested that the Discharge Categories be modified to be able to identify graduation vs. cessation of treatment.
   f. Any questions about these data tools can be emailed to Monica or call to discuss.

5. Monica pointed out that the May statewide System of Care / High Fidelity Wraparound Data Report will be on the website soon.

6. Talk about membership and future strategic planning.
   a. June Meeting will be canceled as we will be in Penn State the following week together.
   b. July Meeting Date will be the July 9, 2015 from 9:00 to 10:30.
   c. We will take a look at our membership to see if we need to recruit new members and identify areas to focus on in the next 6-12 months.