

Agenda ECHO Learning Community: October 15, 2019

9:00 – 9:15

Welcome and Introductions/Reminders

- Basics of Zoom – muting, screen sharing, turning on video
- Introductions

9:15 – 9:30

Presentation: Caitlin McGinnis, Robert Tuton, and Melissa Gomez (All Faiths Children Advocacy Center) – *Updates about their Interactive Focus Group and their coding process*

Overview:

- Cait – one month ago completed interactive focus group (first ever) – had been doing focus groups quarterly but never interactive. Activities with note cards: first question to pair off and share answers, second question answered individually, then final question for brainstorming session.
- Cait feels it went well and that they received answers they weren't expecting. Taking a while to code data, even as a team. Trying to develop themes.
- During group – be more mindful in how you ask the questions and explain the process to get more clear answers, questions and answers we are actually looking for.
- Rob – hard to diagnose why they aren't getting the information, how to "fix" the questions to reflect relevant support

Comments

- Charla: was the staff accepting of this process?
 - o Cait - Yeah, I think they were accepting just needed to figure it out as a group. We split into 4 smaller groups, so it wasn't a huge group of people so that it was more manageable to get everyone's feedback. Is hopeful that others will be open to the change.
- Charla: how many people in focus group?
 - o Cait - Everyone invited but not everyone could come, about 50 total participants.
 - Charla seems impressed!
- Charla: What kind of activity did you do for the second question?
 - o Cait - Everyone had individual notecards and write their responses on their note cards. The pros and cons from the first question we have them write 3 each through an active listening process to then share and write down their partners answers.
- Charla: Would you be willing to share?
 - o Cait & Melissa - Yes!
- Charla: how difficult was it to get the coding process started?

- Cait - It was a little weird, hadn't done it before, but kept reviewing our binders with the definitions of everything and what it really means to code. Once we got into it we got into the flow of what it is supposed to be.
- Rob – Harry Potter metaphors from last month's didactic very helpful.
- Charla is happy to look at the materials and share with the lab.

9:30 – 9:45

Presentation: Anthony Salvagno and Trish Marquez (Explora) – Focus Group and Coding Updates

Overview:

- Anthony – youth apprentice program, 12 kids per cohort, 2 cohorts over the summer. Started to interview all students upon entry – to evaluate their understanding of what science is. One main evaluation point is to determine whether our program is expanding that world view. Another mechanism was to give them a survey at end of the program for each cohort, about 30 questions, expanding on topic areas as a pre- and post- survey as well as weekly reflections. What did they like, what didn't they like?
 - Major Challenges: was found that teams aren't very articulate in their feelings – short responses. Makes it hard to code one-word responses. Instead tried to Caitgorize the responses.
 - Trish – a lot of this was already in place but we received it and fixed some questions in the hope that it would give us the information we wanted. Now I think we have a better understanding of what kinds of questions to ask after going through the Eval Lab.
- Anthony – Screen share pre-survey results.
 - Examples: list some jobs that use science.
 - Tried to code but is mostly just a list. Caitgorized them into different fields instead. Example - Applied science or engineering jobs
 - Started to compare with post surveys (not done with evaluation measurements) but can also Caitgorize responses and compare the number data. After Eval Lab we implemented weekly mission time to look at the data. Started to code separately, and then would discuss and come to consensus to present information. Challenges of coding have stuck: might not come to consensus but might find trends to help build cohesion.
- Trish – we are stuck at the theming part, it has been a challenge. We keep putting it off and we think we have coded something, but it is missing themes. “How do we make this work?” Our questions maybe weren't what we were hoping they would be.
- Anthony – tension between the narrative we want to tell and the narrative the data is telling. We don't have a rubric within the program but used observation as a form of evaluation. Things we have seen and have documentation of but is not as rigorous.

Comments

- Trish – What does this look like at the end? How can we get there? Do we add the codes and themes into a report or summary?

- Charla: we go back to our eval questions and use it as a format. Maybe you have 2-3 questions, you can structure it as a communication – here are our questions and here are the related responses, and with themes you can say these are the things we see come up. Creating, building, example themes can go together in a way that you can use it to support your program outcomes. Once you have the codes, you can identify similarities and try to group that way. If they are responding in this way you can say that it is one of your themes, as pieces of what the participants said as a way to describe the full picture.
- Charla: One-word answers grouping is the perfect thing to do, sometimes we create frequency charts with all the words of what people said and how many times they came up. Can be tricky, might be making qualitative data quantitative, but sometimes that's the best thing we can do. Willing to share?
 - Anthony – sure!
- Kelly – you mentioned that the coding process took time, but can you mention any times that you wish you had allocated in the beginning, and how much time would you have wanted to set each week to dig into the data at the start?
 - Trish – We initially said a very big chunk, but by the end of the 3 hours it was too much. We wanted to knock it out, but it became too much. For us, more than hour was too much and less than an hour was not enough. We are almost there, maybe another few weeks and we might have something more substantial, but sometimes more time may not be better.
 - Anthony – we didn't feel like we knew what we were doing but once we started dedicating more time, the time between the coding sessions helped me to reframe my thoughts to inform how I think about it the next time. Can make it more efficient.
- Anita – How are you giving the feedback to the organization, staff, or board, and in what format? How are you sharing the information in a way that others understand?
 - Cait – Had gotten through first round of theming and came up with about 16 overarching themes and then break it down by each theme. We are still figuring out how to share it with the agency whether that is a survey or a bulletin to individuals but will be a continued process to figure it out. We will submit a quarterly report but figuring out how to make it 'digestible'.
 - Anthony – taking so much time helped us to find out what made the most sense for our director. In our case it was about providing the most useful means of communicating the program itself.
 - Trish – especially in this program because it is not grant funded. It's good to do the process because we can use it as a way to streamline the rest of our evaluation programs. When its grant-funded we do have to do grant reports but for this program we have that extra freedom.
- Kelly – Are there do and don't rules when defining the single descriptive words on the survey? Are there different groups you could share the coding with to divvy up the big data?
 - Charla: anytime you can get more people in it the better, but try to have a few main people. When you try to get everyone back together you should have a few people to go back through the codes to find common ground or differences in ideas to then focus on where they diverge. Refocus the efforts with the main people and dive in in more depth.

9:45 – 10:15

Didactic: Appreciative Inquiry – Presenter: Dr. Charlotte (Lani) Gunawardena

- Lani – how I came to work with appreciative inquiry.
 - Organizational learning and instructional technology – How I use the approach to evaluate the Native American Center for Health.
- What is appreciative inquiry?
 - Anita – has used it a bit, for change management and other activities. My understanding is exploring and asking questions in an appreciative way, for example, if it was the perfect day tomorrow what would it look like?
- Lani – looking at the positive aspect of the program. As external evaluators we have a position of power, can write a report that might reflect poorly on the organization. People sometimes really don't want to be evaluated, but how can we overcome that?
 - Formal Definition: *is the study and exploration of what gives life to human systems when they function at their best.*
- Appreciative Inquiry as an evaluation strategy
 - Inquires into, identifies, and further develops what “is best” in an organization.
 - Emphasizes social constructivism (how we learn from each other and negotiate meaning).
 - To learn and grow together through reflection and dialogue.
 - Will enable us to be involved in the evaluation process.
 - Uses qualitative research design.
 - Enables client-centered approach. Must understand program goals and activities of the organization – helps to become accepted.
 - Collaboration to develop logic models, support consideration of socio-historical contexts
 - Program that focuses on Native American communities, we needed an approach that can be useful to them and incorporated indigenous perspectives to promote collaboration.
 - Past evaluation projects have really misrepresented their communities – makes people skeptical. But we wanted to know what works and what is useful, which allows them to trust us.
 - Case Study – NARCH
 - Goal 1 – encourage research on health disparities effecting Native Americans
 - Goal 2 – Increase number of American Indian scientists, students, health professionals
 - Goal 3 – increase capacity of AAIHB to work in partnership with American Indian communities.
 - Programs to achieve goals – student development programs, scholarship programs, establish Southwest Tribal IRB to look at how researchers and evaluators impact communities.

10:15 – 10:30

Questions, reflections, announcements

- Announcing November 19th ECHO – ethical implications of evaluation and IRB information with Melissa Binder and Claudia Diaz Fuentes.
- Sharing information at the Summer Institute July 27th – July 31st in 2020.
- Thanks and wrap up.