

**MIG Evaluation Workgroup meeting notes**  
**7/20/07**

Present: Quincy Abbot, Pat Anderson, Larry Carlson, George Ducharme, Cindy Gruman, Glendine Henry, Beth McArthur, Amy Porter, Martha Porter, Noreen Shugrue, 2 other National representatives – Barbara and Melissa

**Data needs to be digestible – like a report card. Include process and outcome measures. Show changes without getting bogged down in details**

Unique to CT – CT has richer data than other states – this data can be tied to other data sources, such as LTC needs assessment

5 yrs from now, want data to show legislators, to convince employers to keep hiring people with disabilities.

See it as 1-5 pages, fold-over report card that will show what accomplished something over 1 year

Evaluation Retreat

Needs notes – not clear what decided.

Not huge evaluation Impact from retreat in the process sense – worked on action plans vs. evaluation impact.

New envisioned things and wish list are important (Nat.)

Want to hear about more people with disabilities working (Nat.)

**Workgroups have been asked to consider what they would like to measure, but this has not yet been reported to the committee**

Transportation workgroup has already come up with 6 different indicators based on their objectives - combined outcome and process measures.

- Number of individuals who received info regarding transportation
- Number of individuals who acted on this info
- Number of individuals who got employed b/c of this info
- Get voucher system in place – Num of people who use it

At retreat clear that each workgroup has done it differently – need common indicator (Nat.)

Workgroups need to work on this – there is no consistent focus

Tools need to be shared. Need uniform approach to report on work – CT has grown significantly in 1 year – is ahead of other states in putting in place evaluation ahead of time and having \$ dedicated to it (Nat.)

Look at other states evaluation Tools: VT, ME, WI, VT, MA (somewhat)

Need to feed evaluation info back to MIG, workgroups, legislators

How to get data we have out and visible?

Transition workgroup – no control over outside variables which will impact success. Need to have baseline data collected. Important to consider what can we really do, and what are the constraints.

Evaluators need to inform the workgroups regarding quantitative and qualitative data – what to evaluate – help them understand how important evaluation is.

Because goals differ, workgroups not necessarily have same template, but style and language should be the same

Use parallel work plans. Have plans written up – each workgroup have a different format.

Evaluation staff function to reorient workgroups to work with staff

Important to always consider – What is important to measure? (Nat)

Need good baseline data.

Workgroups should measure immediate, intermediate, and long-term goals, in order to see process. End goals may not be measurable for 5 + years

RFP's also change workgroup evaluations – unknown factor

Multiple levels to the evaluations – for CMS – looking at end goals (Nat)

How intermediate /RFP outcomes relate to CMS report needs (Nat)

Why's of collecting data (Nat)

With each evaluation, identify What trying to show and Who trying to show it to (Nat) For ex., no Nat'l data on PCA use in workplace

For CT this is a policy issue (waiver closed), but we have lots of data on PCA

Include both process and individual measures and indicators (Nat)

Policy = procedural changes

UConn help to figure out how to measure indicators, etc., and will produce report card

Look at structural changes – changes to the system .

Policy / procedure changes are important

#### Overview from retreat

#### **There are multiple levels of evaluation outcomes**

- Macro level – Cost benefit analysis – economics – show legislators why MIG important
- Census data – employment rate, earnings, labor stats, etc.
- Specific outcomes for each workgroup
- Local level evaluations based on RFPs

**Include human, personal element** by following individual person, show their own personal process. Tell their stories – their goals, challenges, successes. Could follow people from around state or from local initiatives. Use story piece throughout process to influence policy makers – see this as ongoing

Can use Connect-ability website to contact people – would you like to be a part of ongoing evaluation

Need data map – show larger framework and mini evaluations

BRS experience – People calling in who want a job. Then takes 2 months from call in to meet with counselor just for orientation. How do you evaluate this?

There are now new staff people from school to work – disability navigators – staff person in select One Stop centers dedicated to helping people with disabilities

Add to website – list of training tools

List barriers and then show how changed – like with the 2 month waiting list

Know some barriers already, like the lack of employers – this has already been evaluated.

What is the goal? Create jobs for people with disabilities Or create process changes?

Can we evaluate the steps – like create resume, connect with transportation, job readiness. If caller calls back – this is a positive outcome. Show progress by individuals

Which pieces important to measure – how/who

- Would it be okay to call you back to see how things work out?
- When do that follow up call, ask Would you like to be part of a long term evaluation?

MIG is an infrastructure grant. Look at what happens now vs. what happened before. Each person's changes are different.

Need to document positive changes systematically.

How found out about BRS, etc.  
BRS collecting some of this now.

Need key measures for each group – system issues – for DMR, etc.

Have 205 data elements now, measuring benefits, disability, employment, etc. for Medicaid, BRS, BPOA, WIPPA, Med. Buy-in. SSDI not included.

Changing attitudes major goal of this grant – of person, of employer.

Need key questions to ask re attitudes

Need to know what the key priorities are to measure

Transition workgroup has goals for the evaluation to measure. We need assistance to help develop survey to evaluate these.

**Each workgroup needs to come up with own indicators and plan as to how to measure them – then the Evaluation team can help**

Evaluation Committee may need to work with each workgroup and help them prioritize indicators

Tell me your top three

Prioritize changes to measure within workgroups

Take into account Purpose and Audience (Nat.). Need report tailored to each audience – employer, etc.

Need list of audiences – identify which audience going to

Track legislative changes, inter-department changes, cultural changes (Nat)

Demonstrate how systems have changed (Nat)

How it is expected to have this impact

What is the ultimate, overarching change want to see? State level change.

How can each workgroup show changes. Show systems changes vs. band aid fixes (Nat)

Already in evaluation plan to include people who call in or go to website

Major things to say – big picture things

Change in attitudes – survey employers and BRS system

In 4 yr repeat process

Give brief survey to transition coordinators to gauge attitudes

**Different levels of change to evaluate: (Nat+)**

- 1) Cultural changes – attitudes (local/state level)
- 2) System changes (state level)
- 3) Increasing access to existing services and supports – on-line info or workgroup evaluations (local and state level)
- 4) Economic changes – cost-benefit analysis (state level)
- 5) Annual employment rate disparities people with and without disabilities (state level)
- 6) Individual level changes –looking at own work history (state level)

Need process map for individual level. For ex., shrink time for how long between when contact BRS, meet with BRS, get job

If you want to measure it, we will measure it

Audiences = general public, employers, people with disabilities, legislators, gov't individuals

Look at statewide level with technical assistance center – workgroups look at local level

Need template for each group

Stratify by type of disability – self report  
Mental illness is poorly captured

Severity of disability can have great impact,  
But hard to capture – not as much impact as you think

Capture this in their stories

Start using data we have already to produce issue briefs now

Re-circulate instruments we have already

Use Federal data, too

State employment leadership network  
Vocational Rehab agencies – see what they have collected  
Do report cards for each person?

**The MIG evaluation subcommittee will now meet every 1st Wed from 3-4:30 at Office of Protection and Advocacy. The next meeting is August 1.**