

TTC Evaluators Special Interest Group

**Meeting Agenda: July 22, 2020**

**Attendance: 30 participants**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Topic*** | ***Presenter*** | ***Notes*** |
| Welcome and agenda review | Megan Hawkes and Liz Walker |  |
| SIG participant updates on upcoming: evaluation conferences, listservs, events, presentations, webinars, etc. | Group | * The New England PTTC is partnering with the Northwest PTTC on a presentation about evaluation at the virtual NPN conference in August. * The Great Lakes and Pacific Southwest PTTCs are also partnering on a presentation for the virtual NPN conference. |
| GPRA Discussion for Series | Heather Gotham | GPRA for event series:   * Would like to get feedback from this group about GPRA’ing closed group scenarios to help determine consistent guidelines across the TTCs. * There are implications for participant numbers and event numbers to consider. For example, does a 5-part closed series count as 1 event or 5 events?   Group Discussion:   * Data should reflect effort and time spent. * Concern about doing 1-time assessment for a series because trainers can vary within the series. For example, one trainer can be used to conduct part 1 and another trainer for part 2. Would like to capture separate feedback as attendees may have had different experiences with the trainers. * Concern about doing 1-time assessment for a series because each session in that series may have different objectives. * For website usability purposes, it makes sense to add the series as one event to avoid website users from going to separate pages to get information on a series. * For website usability purposes and if trying to capture a series as one event, can we add the option of noting multiple dates for a series? * A survey on this topic (<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSe2lKgGoOR5w9OmXWC0CVNpOZPh8VNxk7RgOkKX-HGZx-d2aw/viewform>) was sent to the group a few weeks ago. 14 people responded with responses varying. However, the majority suggested that GPRAs for such series be counted as one event. * Concern not to exceed GPRA targets too much as it gives off a certain perception with implications for future funding (“Oh, look at how much the TTCs are doing with x amount of funding!”) * Seems the issue of GPRA’ing series can’t be a one-size-fits-all. Perhaps a decision tree that the TTCs can use should be created around this. * Next steps: If you didn’t get a chance to complete the survey prior to today, please do so. The survey results will go back to the NCOs and the chairs of this group to review and come up with some guidance. |
| Spotlight Panel Discussion Cultural Competence in TTC Evaluation | Richard Cervantes (National Hispanic and Latino ATTC and PTTC), Rachele Espiritu (Pacific Southwest MHTCC), and Teresa Brewington (National American Indian and Alaska Native MHTTC) | Introduction:   * Megan Hawkes introduced the panelists for today who will be discussing how they integrate cultural competence in their TTC evaluations. * Panelists: Dr. Richard Cervantes (National Hispanic and Latino ATTC and PTTC) and Dr. Rachele Espiritu (Pacific Southwest MHTTC). Teresa Brewington will be unable to join today due to a scheduling conflict.   Presentation by Richard Cervantes:   * In Year 1, they conducted a web-based survey with 389 Latino stakeholders. * Identified the most common topics and needs. * Used the results of this survey to guide future workplan activities at their TTCs. * Ongoing strategies include recruiting presenters who have cultural experience, delivering trainings in various languages, and addressing the most common topics from the survey. * Added new questions following GPPRA questions to identify emerging training needs, cultural practice considerations, and suggestions for improvement. * Using QSR for qualitative analysis. The most frequent qualitative response has been in response to the time management of trainings. * Evaluation team meets weekly with the program staff team.   Presentation by Rachele Espiritu:   * Shared about their “Expanding the Bench” initiative, which was largely instigated by philanthropy. * This initiative takes into consideration how to diversify the field of evaluation and data access. The evaluation field has collected data from communities of color, but often times, not included them as evaluators of data. * Culturally responsive and equitable evaluation (CREE) requires the integration of diversity, inclusion, and equity in all phases of evaluation. CREE advances equity by informing strategy, program improvement, decision-making, policy formation and social change. * Incorporating CREE into their Center’s activities using a theory of change that they developed internally. * They have a database of evaluators of color. * They also offer professional development on the practice of CREE.   Group Discussion:   * CREE is factual and aspirational. It is based on some literature about the validity of data that doesn’t take culture into account. * Culturally responsive evaluation is an approach that should be infused into all aspects of evaluation. It’s not a single method. * The Advisory Board could be a great way to engage someone who has expertise in evaluation with diverse populations and/or culturally responsive evaluation. * There is diversity within each culture. There are cultural identifiers but culture can be broken down into many variables such as acculturation level, values, etc. * We all bring a lens that affects how we ask questions, view data, and determine additional analyses. * This type of evaluation takes a lot more time and resources. Unfortunately, funding can sometimes limit the process. * Needs assessments: The National Hispanic and Latino ATTC/PTTC culturally informed assessment was developed with a group of stakeholders and included quantitative and qualitative questions. The data was then shared with other stakeholders, including the advisory boards, to assist in the data interpretation process. Their Centers have relied on the qualitative evaluation to inform their work and impact. * Regarding needs assessments, consider engaging the end-user in the approach, too. * How can respondents have power and voice in the evaluation/assessment process? Are there opportunities to combine data from TTCs to explore differences across demographic groups. This could be helpful for collective programming. For example, the National Hispanic and Latino ATTC and PTTC would benefit from a better understanding of how non-Latinos who attend Latino-focused trainings evaluate trainings. * Given that most TTCs are regionally focused, having a national lens on data would be helpful for informing regional engagement strategies. * The TTCs can consider sharing case studies (with follow up data) focused on cultural proficiency. * It is also important to think about language issues in evaluation as this creates a barrier. * Additional resources on this topic: AEA (Rachele will find and share with group), Georgetown University (Richard will find and share with group), expandingthebench.org, and ACE Evaluators Network. * Strategies TTCs can adopt: compare participant demographics versus regional demographics and identify where there are population gaps, compare evaluation results with your disparity impact statement. |
| Recap and ending remarks   * Next meeting date * Volunteers and/or ideas for spotlight around cultural competency | Megan/ Liz | The next meeting will be in September. The group would like to continue spotlighting what different TTCs are doing for evaluation and monitoring. Please connect with Megan or Liz if interested in sharing what your TTC is doing regarding evaluation and monitoring, and/or suggestions for agenda items. |