

Preliminary Evaluation Results *(from semi-annual report dated 4-27-07)*

Overview

C4 evaluation activities continued throughout this reporting period with the majority of data collection activities taking place during the three training sessions. At the start of each session, a project staff member briefly explained the purpose of the evaluation and obtained signed consent from the session participants. Participants were then asked to complete a content knowledge pretest and a cultural competency self-assessment. After the training was concluded for that session, participants were asked to complete a content knowledge posttest and a training satisfaction questionnaire.

The process of conducting the cultural competency self-assessment follow-ups continued during this reporting period using a mailing protocol outlined by Dillman (2000). The mailing process begins approximately two to five months after the last training session and technical assistance event in the training cycle.

Additional evaluation activities occurred during this reporting period. The process of data entry, data cleaning, and preliminary data analysis in response to PART requirements was also initiated and completed. Ongoing, informal discussions were held with key C4 staff during the reporting to track the implementation of the project. The final round of key informant interviews will be conducted during the next reporting period.

Preliminary Analysis

The following narrative and tables describe the ongoing preliminary analysis conducted during this reporting period. *Please note that the data reported are cumulative across reporting periods.* Not all of the data collected as part of the evaluation were included in this preliminary analysis (e.g., the Supervisor's Survey) and no tests of statistical significance were conducted given the preliminary nature of the data.

Table 3 provides information on the numbers of participants thus far in the project and evaluation. The Expressed Interest column refers to the number of individuals who contacted the project and indicated an interest in attending a training session or the technical assistance event. The Signed-Up column refers to the seating capacity of the training/technical assistance facility that placed a ceiling on the number of individuals who could possibly participate. The Participant column refers to the number of individuals who participated in the trainings/technical assistance events. The disparities between Participants column and the Signed-Up column are due to non-attendees whose decision to not attend the training/technical assistance event came too late for project staff to fill the available slots. The Baseline Sample refers to participants who provided demographic information at the start of the training/technical assistance event. Evaluation data was not collected during the technical assistance event held during the reporting period. As a result, the baseline sample does not include any of the participants who attended the event.

Table 3: C4 Training and Technical Assistance Event Participants and Sample

	Expressed Interest ¹		Signed-Up ²		Participants ³		Baseline Sample ⁴	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
R1 Trainings	193	18	187	23	129	69	85	66
R2 Trainings	435	39	257	31	225	88	198	88
R3 Trainings	303	27	237	29	200	84	169	85
TA	172	16	139	17	107	77	0	39
Total	1103	100	820	100	661	81	452	68

¹ n = the number of individuals who expressed interest in the training; % = percentage of Total Expressed Interest

² n = room capacity of the training facility; % = percentage of Total Signed-Up

³ n = the number of participants; % = percentage of Signed-Up for a specific training or technical assistance event

⁴ n = the number of participants who completed at least one of the instruments; % = percentage of Participants

Table 4 shows the demographic information of the Baseline Sample. Disparities between the Baseline Sample (n =452) and any specific demographic characteristic is due to missing data. The majority of respondents were female (87%), in their late 30's, and identified as Hispanic/Latino(a) (62%). A smaller proportion of participants were representatives of public child welfare agency (35%) compared to other organizations (65%).

Table 4: C4 Training and Technical Assistance Event Sample Demographic Information

Baseline Sample ¹	n	%
Female	394	87
Male	56	12
African-American	14	3
Asian/Pacific Islander	12	3
Hispanic/Latino	278	62
Native American	3	1
White	110	24
Other	32	7

Child Welfare Supervisor	11	3
Child Welfare Worker	146	32
Other	290	65

	M	Md	Min	Max	SD
Age (n = 408)	39	36	20	69	13.86

¹ Frequencies not totaling n = 452 are due to missing data elements

Table 5 shows the results from the Content Knowledge Pretest and Posttest. The tests are identical and are based on the curriculum used in the training sessions. The average score improved by 1.5 points between the pretest and posttest while the median score improved 1.0 point.

Table 5: C4 Content Knowledge Pretest and Posttest Results

	M	Md	Min	Max	SD
Knowledge Score—Pre (n=450)	5.6	6.0	0	10	1.9
Knowledge Score—Post (n=447)	7.1	7.0	0	10	2.1

An additional analysis was conducted to determine the number and percentage of individuals who experienced an improvement between their pretest and their posttest. Table 6 shows these results. Over two-thirds of the sample improved their score over time.

Table 6: C4 Knowledge Score Improvement Results

	n ¹	%
Yes	306	69
Same	86	19
No	53	12

¹ n=7 did not have both and pretest and posttest score

Four hundred and three members of the sample responded to an additional question on the Content Knowledge posttest that sought to assess their perception of their knowledge level prior to the training and after the training. As shown in Table 7, only 7% of the

respondents indicated they perceived their knowledge level to be high prior to the training. That is in contrast to the 53% who perceived their knowledge level to be high after the training.

Table 7: Perception of Knowledge Level Results (Low to High)

	Low		Lo-Med		Medium		Med-Hi		High	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Pre	3	1	42	10	172	43	158	39	28	7
Post	0	0	0	0	16	4	173	43	214	53

A final question regarding knowledge gained through the training was included as part of the Cultural Competency Self-Assessment follow-up. Individuals were asked whether they had used the knowledge/skills learned from the training in their work with Spanish-speaking children and families. The results reported here include respondents from the first two sets of trainings. Of the 126 respondents, 101 (87%) indicated that they had used knowledge/skills from the training in their work (Table 8).

Table 8: C4 Knowledge/Skills Use Results

	n	%
Yes	101	87
No	15	13

The Cultural Competency Self-Assessment results are a reduction of 15 distinct questions into three categories—Physical Environment, Materials, and Resources; Communication Styles; Values and Attitudes—as shown in Table 9. The baseline respondents numbered 452, while the follow-up respondents numbered 116 (the follow-up respondents are from the first two sets of trainings). The percentage of respondents who indicated “frequently” increased for each of the three categories between baseline and follow-up.

Table 9: C4 Cultural Competency Self-Assessment Results

Physical Environment, Materials, and Resources

	Frequently		Occasionally		Rarely/Never	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Baseline	329	36	278	31	274	30

Follow-up	97	42	66	28	61	26
-----------	----	----	----	----	----	----

(Missing: baseline n=23, 3%; follow-up n=8, 3%)

Communication Styles

	Frequently		Occasionally		Rarely/Never	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Baseline	1617	72	261	12	155	7
Follow-up	432	74	48	8	52	9

(Missing: baseline n=227, 10%; follow-up n=48, 11%)

Values and Attitudes

	Frequently		Occasionally		Rarely/Never	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Baseline	2952	65	990	22	373	8
Follow-up	849	73	228	20	60	5

(Missing: baseline n=204, 5%; follow-up n=23, 2%)

Table 10 shows the results from the Training Satisfaction Questionnaire. The majority of responses to all the questions fell in the “Very Good” and “Excellent” categories. Respondents seemed particularly pleased with the organization and flow of the training, the facilitator (particularly his responsiveness and his effectiveness at conveying ideas), and the value and usefulness of the written materials and information from the training.

Table 10: C4 Training Satisfaction Results

Question 1: Overall workshop rating.

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good		Excellent	
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
0	0	2	1	52	11	203	42	225	47

n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
0	0	1	1	44	9	145	30	291	60

Question 8: Overall facility rating.

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good		Excellent	
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
3	1	6	2	72	15	163	34	235	49

References

Dillman, D.A. (2000). Mail and internet survey: The Tailored Design method. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.