



**Objective:** Evaluation Committee for MIG project

**Meeting Date:** 8/6/08

**Meeting Place:** UCE Farmington

**Attendees:**

Pat Anderson, Larry Carlson, George Ducharme, Kerri Fradette, Glendine Henry, Joe Madaus (conference), Terry Nowakowski, Amy Porter, Margarita Torres, Cindy Gruman (conference), Julie Robison, Noreen Shugrue, Martha Porter.

**Action Items from August 6, 2008 or earlier:**

Item	Action	Responsibility	Due Date	Status
1.	Evaluation training July 8th	Cindy/Noreen/Julie	7/8/08	done
2.	Modify forms to include space for related activities	Cindy/Noreen	7/8/08	done
3.	Contact J regarding online quarterly reporting	Cindy/Noreen/Julie	7/18/08	done
4.	Examine results of pilot toolkit evaluation	Margarita	September	
5.	Pre-population of report card	Noreen, Cindy	September	
6.	Send historical information for Section 1 already written by Amy for strategic plan	Amy		
7.	Noreen to gather info from Larry to write Section 3	Noreen/Larry		

Process evaluation plan

Current draft of CT Process Evaluation plan reviewed and discussed by Committee. Highlights:

Section 1.

- Gives broadest picture and context. Include process of grant, why BRS lead agency not VR.
- Include description of what is VR as well.
- Some content already written from when Amy had to submit strategic plan.

Section 3.

- Separate into Historical and Structural
- Historical perspective of MIG activities going back to pre-MIG I. Do not include systems change. Just what was within grant, such as when added website workgroup, new activities, etc.
- CT changed way we did evaluation to include infrastructure changes. Made dramatic changes, such as with barriers. Include process of how we got there.

- BRS structure, roles and responsibilities changed since first grant. History of Amy and Larry – part of original Ticket to Work program, Medicaid Buy-in, Systems change grants, BODP, MIG I grants, and benefits counseling grant.
- Include committees in structural
- Larry will provide info to help write this section.

#### Section 6.

- Expand this section. State as model employer is only one piece.

#### Section 9.

- Expand discussion of CT's partners. Include all subcontractors, professional expertise CT utilized: MPR, Cathy Ludlum, George Ducharme, Tech Act, UConn, PCG, J Morrow.
- Move BLN to Section 7
- Build on activities external to state. Highlight national interactions that CT MIG has had at CMS conferences, such as presentation at MIGRATS
- Special consideration to NEP
- Describe with other systems change grants: CPASS, Real Choice, MFP, Mental Health Systems, DDS, 2 for 1. This is part of the process is how CT is doing this work.

#### Section 10. Delete (see below)

#### Section 11.

- Include recommendations in conclusions.

#### TA evaluation plan

Discussion of elements of TA evaluation vs. what belongs in another evaluation area. Only stand alone TA activity is TA provided to other states by Larry and cannot be evaluated. Evaluation of toolkits included elsewhere. Any evaluation of other TA activities (1-800 number, TA given to local pilots, local website, documentation of saturation) is a direct outcome of stakeholder education. Committee decision to delete TA evaluation piece and include in underlying work group evaluations.

#### Report card

Goal to give first version to the Steering Committee in early fall. Include data from January 2008 on. Will need to fill in historical data. Can use information obtained through infrastructure interviews, as some questions retrospective for past year. Pre-populate report card now.

#### Toolkit evaluation process

Refocusing to do quality control instead of employer pre/post toolkit interviews. Finding it difficult to find method to measure/evaluate its success. Suggestion to partner with BLN to give to new BLN members and later evaluate, possibly using limited web-based access. Suggestion to perhaps partner with Chambers of Commerce.

#### Obtaining recent graduates for target interviews

Goal to talk with kids with disabilities who have recently left high school about their experiences in school. What could your high school have done better to help you get a job? What helped and what would you like to see happen differently? Need 250 – 300 youth (ages 18 – 25 ) to start with. Problem of how to identify them? Recruitment suggestions from committee included:

- Select school districts from SDE survey and then contact transition coordinator.

- VR agencies?
- BRS has data for consumers age 18 – 25
- Work with local level pilots – the 8 looking at schools
- BESB also gets young adults.
- Community colleges like MCC or state colleges like CCSU