

**Summary of Findings
Progress Towards Goals Survey
Jefferson County Systems of Care Grant**

Butler Institute for Families

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Submitted by:
Butler Institute for Families
University of Denver
Graduate School of Social Work
March 2008

Jefferson County Systems of Care Grant Results of Progress Towards Goals Survey

Introduction

Jefferson County Department of Human Services (DHS), Children, Youth & Families Division (CYF), was awarded a five-year federal grant entitled “Improving Child Welfare Outcomes Through Systems of Care” (SOC). The SOC grants, awarded to sites across the United States, are intended to improve the level of child safety, permanency, and well-being by providing services that are based upon five SOC principles. The principles are: 1) inter-agency collaboration and communication; 2) cultural competence; 3) family involvement; 4) services based upon individual strengths and community-based delivery; and 5) mechanisms in place to ensure accountability.

The purpose of the Advisory and Evaluation Committee(s) is to build interagency collaboration and support, disseminate information, and facilitate the principles of the SOC grant. The Progress Towards Goals (PTG) Survey is completed by participants in order to gather information about the perceived level of productivity of each committee. Based on this feedback, grant staff can make modifications to the facilitation and activities of the subcommittees to ensure meaningful and productive meetings.

Methods

The Progress Towards Goals Survey was administered to those members that attended the Advisory Committee during August 2007 and again in January 2008. The survey was administered to the Evaluation Subcommittee during April 2007 and again in February 2008. The 24-item survey asked about goals and purpose of the committee, identity and membership, productivity, and accountability. The Likert-style items ranged from 1 to 5, where 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; and 5 = Strongly Agree. For the Evaluation Committee, 6 participants out of 10 completed the survey in 2007, and five responded in 2008; for the Advisory Subcommittee, 11 out of 18 members completed the survey in 2007, and 12 responded in 2008. Participants were asked to complete the survey anonymously, and the surveys were collected and placed in a sealed envelope by a grant staff member. SOC staff coded surveys with a numeric identifier, entered the data into an Excel database, and emailed the data to the Butler Institute for Families for analysis and interpretation.

Results

Results in the current report are presented for 2008, while the 2007 results are summarized in a previous report. However, means from 2007 and 2008 are summarized in the data below.

Evaluation Subcommittee

The number of Evaluation Committee meetings that participants had attended ranged from 5 to 25, with an average of 13.7 meetings. Most of the responses of the subcommittee members were between “neutral” and “strongly agree,” with the highest mean score being 4.60 for two items regarding productivity (“This committee has a strong facilitator who keeps us on task” and “Meeting agendas are used to achieve goals and tasks of the project”). The lowest mean score was 2.60 (“It will be clear when the work of this committee is complete”). This may be due to the fact that the grant is in its final year and questions about sustainability of the work of the subcommittee in relation to the grant project still remain. Overall, mean ratings were higher in 2008 than in 2007, suggesting that feedback from the 2007 PTG survey was used to improve the functioning of the workgroup (Table 1). Areas rating as “neutral” in April of 2007, regarding accountability of the members, how work of the subcommittee is shared, and impact on stakeholders all improved and were rated as “agree” or “strongly agree” in 2008. As the project reaches the end of the grant period, the project team might want to facilitate subcommittee discussions about timelines for committee work, as well as how evaluation reports and findings will be developed disseminated.

Table 1: Evaluation Subcommittee Survey Results (Date: February 7, 2008)

1-5 Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree

Goals and Purpose	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean (02-08)	Mean (04-07)
1. I am clear about the goals and purpose of this committee.	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	3.33
2. I am clear about my role and responsibilities on this committee.	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	3.17
3. Since I've been attending this committee, the goals and purpose have changed.	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	3.17
4. Other people who are not members understand the goals and purpose of the committee.	0	1	4	0	0	2.80	2.33
5. It will be clear when the work of this committee is complete.	0	3	1	1	0	2.60	3.00
6. The work plan and timelines for completing the tasks of this committee have been made clear to me.	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	2.83

Goals and Purpose	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean (02-08)	Mean (04-07)
Identity and Membership							
7. The right people are members of this committee.	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	2.83
8. Members of this committee attend regularly.	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	3.00
9. All of the members of this committee participate as equals.	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	3.33
10. Members of this committee are collaborative with one another during our meetings.	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	3.83
11. This committee is just about the right size to be productive and get things done.	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	3.17
Productivity							
12. This committee has a strong facilitator who keeps us on task.	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	3.67
13. Meeting agendas are used to achieve goals and tasks of the project.	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	3.83
14. Our timelines for tasks that we set for ourselves are reasonable and doable.	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	3.50
15. This committee is productive and gets things done.	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	3.17
16. Other people who are not members think this committee is productive and gets things done.	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	2.67
17. We use our time wisely when we meet.	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	3.83

Goals and Purpose	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean (02-08)	Mean (04-07)
Accountability							
18. Members of this committee hold one another accountable to accomplish our tasks.	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	2.67
19. The work of this committee has had a positive/constructive impact on:							
a. Children and families.	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	3.33
b. Jefferson County Division of Children, Youth & Families.	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	3.67
c. Child and family agencies serving Jefferson County.	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	3.33
20. The products and results of this committee’s work are widely shared with others.	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	2.33

Advisory Group Committee

For the Advisory Committee meetings, participants attended between 1 and 25 meetings, with an average of 8.9 meetings. As shown in Table 2, the ratings of participants of the Advisory Committee were higher than those of the Evaluation Committee, ranging from 2.75 (“Members of this committee attend regularly”) to 4.42 (“I am clear about my role and responsibilities on this committee”). Other items that were rated as “strongly agree” include: “I am clear about the goals and purpose of this committee”, “Members of this committee are collaborative with one another”, “the committee has a strong facilitator who keeps us on task”, and “meeting agendas are used to achieve the goals and tasks of the project.” Areas that were rated between “neutral” and “agree” include “other people who are not members understand the goals and purposes of the committee”, “The committee is just about the right size to be productive, and “Other people who are not members think this committee think this committee is productive. Mean ratings for almost all items improved from 2007 to 2008. In particular, committee members felt much clearer about work plan and timelines for completing committee tasks (mean ratings of 2.8 in 2007 and 4.0 in 2008).

Table 2: Advisory Group Subcommittee Survey Results (Date: January 24, 2008)

1-5 Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree

Goals and Purpose	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean (01-08)	Mean (09-07)
1. I am clear about the goals and purpose of this committee.	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	3.64
2. I am clear about my role and responsibilities on this committee.	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	3.91
3. Since I've been attending this committee, the goals and purpose have changed.	0	1	5	5	1	3.50	3.00
4. Other people who are not members understand the goals and purpose of the committee.	0	1	8	2	1	3.25	2.82
5. It will be clear when the work of this committee is complete.	0	1	4	6	1	3.58	2.73
6. The work plan and timelines for completing the tasks of this committee have been made clear to me.	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	2.82
Identity and Membership							
7. The right people are members of this committee.	0	4	3	4	1	3.17	2.45
8. Members of this committee attend regularly.	0	6	3	3	0	2.75	2.64
9. All of the members of this committee participate as equals.	0	2	2	6	2	3.67	3.09
10. Members of this committee are collaborative with one another during our meetings.	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	4.09
11. This committee is just about the right size to be productive and get things done.	0	2	5	4	1	3.33	3.55

Goals and Purpose	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean (01-08)	Mean (09-07)
Productivity							
12. This committee has a strong facilitator who keeps us on task.	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	3.91
13. Meeting agendas are used to achieve goals and tasks of the project.	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	3.82
14. Our timelines for tasks that we set for ourselves are reasonable and doable.	0	0	3	8	1	3.83	3.55
15. This committee is productive and gets things done.	0	0	6	2	3	3.73	3.27
16. Other people who are not members think this committee is productive and gets things done.	0	2	5	3	1	3.27	3.09
17. We use our time wisely when we meet.	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	3.73
Accountability							
18. Members of this committee hold one another accountable to accomplish our tasks.	0	1	8	1	2	3.33	3.18
19. The work of this committee has had a positive/constructive impact on:							
a. Children and families.	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	3.55
b. Jefferson County Division of Children, Youth & Families.	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	3.64
c. Child and family agencies serving Jefferson County.	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	3.55
20. The products and results of this committee's work are widely shared with others.	0	2	3	5	2	3.58	3.18