



Evaluation Lab ECHO Learning Community

October 25th, 2018

12:00pm - 1:15 pm

Video and phone participants: 19

Number of organizations represented: 6

Hub-in person participants:

Facilitator: Sonia Bettez

Tech person: Melissa Binder

ECHO Account administrator: Kristina Kutemeyer

Meeting Started at 12:05pm

Welcome and Introductions:

Sonia started the meeting by asking participants to introduce themselves and report on their evaluation progress.

Attending:

Sonia Bettez – Facilitator

Melissa Binder – Eval Lab

Jessica Jones – Echo

Mark Hume – Evaluation Lab

Khadijah Jacobs – Evaluation Lab

Lauren Hutchison – Evaluation Lab

Ryan Tolman – (over the phone) - PED

Claudia Diaz Fuentes – Evaluation Lab

Reina Martinez – City of Albuquerque

Christina Mendivil - Doña Ana County Health & Human Services

Norberto Godina - Doña Ana County Health & Human Services

Nancy Vazquez - Doña Ana County Health & Human Services.

Cynthia Melugin– State BHD

Martha Payne – State BHD

Echo Members

Successes:



Christa is still continuing to meet with new groups. And they are starting to make a logic model with a new group leader.

Challenges:

N/a

Didactic: Summer Institute Full Evaluation Report

Sonia went through the last draft of the Summer Institute Evaluation Report. We went over the activities and the evaluation techniques that Sonia and Paige used to find major themes, defining the outcomes, and feedback from the Summer Institute.

Sonia went over the learning outcomes that came out of the report, within each activity including: mission time, maintaining enthusiasm, continuing evaluation support, and feedback for the summer institute.

Summer institute fulfilled its mission of building enthusiasm and capacity for evaluation around the state. Participants learned important skills and felt supported throughout.

Sonia then went over the protocol in the appendix of the report. This protocol focused around these major goals:

1. Participants feel positively (energized) about taking on evaluation and agree that evaluation is possible and meaningful.
2. Participants learn the basic process of evaluation.
3. Participants recognize grind thinking (survival mode) vs. mission thinking and are motivated into mission thinking.
4. Participants learn different options for evaluation that are within reach – not always numbers and not always just to evaluate what the funders want. Participants learn that they have control over measuring what matters to them.
5. Participants leave the institute with the confidence to conduct evaluation in their organization with support from the Evaluation Lab through ECHO meetings.

Questions / Input:

Sonia was asked about any plans to continue evaluation support after the 'Learning Sessions' are complete. Sonia talked about administering a feedback survey during the final ECHO session for feedback to continue to make plans for future ECHO sessions based on the needs of the participants.

Jessica asked who the evaluation report is being shared with. Sonia answered that the report is for you to know what happened, and for us to be able to review and evaluate how to improve. We also use the report to inform funders about the outcomes of our program.

Presentations:



1). **Christina Mendivil** from Dona Ana County.

She and her colleagues shared a program matrix showing a list of all the different programs within their organization. She showed the projects and focus for each and discussed the planning and mission time that happened within each of the programs.

Each of the programs have their own team leads, mission time, and logic models. She discussed realizations and better understanding that have come from this sort of evaluation in their organization.

Questions / Input: [summarized quotes]

If anyone has ideas on how to help people engage who are not interested?

Echo: Something that helps is being able to see the benefit or buy-in to help them understand why it's important to be able to what they are doing.

Sonia: I wonder if changing the logic model to measure outcomes that actually matter to the organization could increase the engagement. She also asked Christina and her team if spearheading mission time and evaluation practices has added new responsibilities on top of their duties from before?

Christina: This is something we have been doing, extra, but it helps that they have support and that the organization has been doing evaluation before. However, as goals and funding change, mission time is helping focus on what is important.

Sonia: It makes people feel better if they can see the progress they have started.

2). **Echo Institute: (Sarah Gonzales VanHorn):** Updating both projects:

1.) Bringing the stakeholders of the County Jail program together to help the system communicate more effectively so that those persons leaving the jail don't fall through the cracks and end up back in jail.

2.) Self-evaluation and making sure they, as ECHO employees, are achieving their goals.

Echo showed their logic model for their first project. They are in the middle of starting a quality improvement program. In this way they want to make sure the small part that Echo plays in this project is achieving what they need to without stepping on anyone's toes. Echo is looking at the entire system. They are evaluating whether the jail is doing the screening they need to be doing, if the returning citizens are being evaluated, if the resource center is being effective. This process is looking at all the systems working together and looking at the stakeholders needs. This will start in January.

Something that changed from after the Summer Institute is the addition of Mission Time. Summer Institute helped Echo be able to implement a lot of new things and get more done. Echo runs over 40+ programs, so each member is involved in several different programs. They said they are very involved but the level of engagement they have seen in the programs from the Evaluation Lab has been different.

Aspects of the second project have been implemented to develop a road map and developing a vision and goal for the new Echo Model. They are looking at the experience of launching an ECHO. Venice stated that sometimes people don't know how an ECHO works. They are working on visuals right now that will be presented to members of the leadership team in the upcoming months to see how this can be implemented for new training programs.



Questions / Input: [summarized quotes]

Sonia: What maintains enthusiasm at Echo?

Christina: The interdisciplinary way that Echo works helps everyone stay engaged. And by measuring power dynamics and making sure everyone's voices are heard.

Venice: For me, I like the challenge of looking at the process of making sure everyone's voices are heard.

Rachel from Echo: Something helpful to me is working across different areas of Echo. This way we get different perspectives from Echo from people with different backgrounds. For example, she has been able to work closely with Sarah, which she did not before.

Cynthia from Echo: This is one of the few programs we are working on with a quality improvement focus. We have realized that when conflict occurs, it is created by the system and not by the people. It's being able to see what we can do in the system we are working in.

3). Cynthia Melugin and Martha Payne from Behavioral Health Services Division (BHSD). They developed an evaluation plan for the Linkages Support of Houses Program. They got pretty far in developing a logic model in Summer Institute. After that ended, they set aside an hour a week for mission time to finish logic model. Then they got feedback and incorporated the logic model.

Then they worked on rubrics for each of the outcomes in their logic model. They shared the screen showing the rubrics and stated that they had to think really hard about what each outcome even meant. They spend a lot of time going and forth defining their terms and making sure they knew what each meant. They think they have a better tool because they had a large amount of time to go back and be so detailed about evaluating their outcomes. There was a lot of reexamination that they found useful.

The second thing that emerged in developing the rubric was that it really easy to find the 'weak' and 'effective' categories, but it was harder to find what was 'developing' and 'exemplary'. They said sometimes it felt like they were stretching to fill in the categories.

Sonia commented that their process exemplifies how they had to keep going back and forth between the logic model and the rubrics.

Questions / Input: [summarized quotes]

Cynthia: What difference does it make to have 3 labels instead of four? Does it matter down the road? Or just for continuity? Sometimes we felt like our labels didn't fit very well.

Jessica: From a measurement perspective, this happens all the time. It would be great to have a unifying scale, but it's very language dependent but common. I'm kind of more of a fan of the labels being semantically useful. I wouldn't force it. Finding something someone else can pick up and understand what you are trying to measure is much easier.



Christina: We tied in the rubrics to performance evaluation, and that was easier to understand for everyone.

Closing Comments:

Before concluding Sonia wanted to talk about how when you're developing a rubric you go back to the logic model. This makes the logic model a living and changing document because, at you develop the rubrics, you may realize that there is a need for more or different resources, or that the activities don't lead to the desired outcomes. The process also highlighted the need to work on what the organization can control. This examination is what the process is all about. She also talked about being able to measure what is actually helping the program and the goals of the process.

Then she thanked everyone and she gave a quick preview of the upcoming meeting on November 8th, when we will administer a survey to evaluate the first round of six ECHO meetings and to gather information to plan the next round of six meetings.

Meeting concluded at 1:03pm.

Post-Meeting Reflections:

Text