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Evaluation Strategies

Formative evaluation
• Ensures integrity and quality of products

Implementation evaluation
• Mixed methods design

Outcome evaluation
• Mixed-methods, longitudinal design, Research-driven
Evaluation Features

- Participatory collaborative approach
- Just-in-time information
- Implementation and outcomes
- Decision-making guide
- Outcome data
Major Findings & Conclusions (1)

• NCWWI successfully developed a leadership training for child welfare managers and supervisors and a stipend program for BSW and MSW students

• Child welfare managers, supervisors, and stipend students all demonstrated significant competency gains that are sustained over time
Major Findings & Conclusions (2)

- **Workforce supports for child welfare supervisors and middle managers**, such as coaching/mentoring, peer and supervisory support, and a learning environment, ensure continued skills development and application of leadership competencies to systems change initiatives.

- **Workforce supports are essential for successful transition of MSW and BSW graduates from school to work**, including strong supervision, positive agency climate, continued professional development and opportunities to use skills to serve children and families.
TRAINEESHIPS: Evaluation Findings
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSW Programs</th>
<th>Joint MSW/BSW Programs</th>
<th>BSW Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve University (OH)</td>
<td>New Mexico State University</td>
<td>Briar Cliff University (IA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University (OR)</td>
<td>University of Maryland, Baltimore</td>
<td>Clark Atlanta University (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>University of Montana</td>
<td>Northeastern State University (OK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University (NY)</td>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>Salem State University (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>University at Albany (NY)</td>
<td>University of South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Denver (CO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Traineeship Evaluation Findings

• High satisfaction with BSW/MSW programs
• Significant competency gains from baseline to follow-up that persist after graduation
• Commitment to a career in child welfare peaks at the end of their education programs, dips in the year after graduation, and then rises
• Increased time pressure and lack of coping skills leads to higher levels of Secondary Traumatic Stress
Traineeship Students & Graduates

- 4 cohorts of students from 2009 through 2013
- 63% NCWWI-funded, 37% funded as Comprehensive Workforce Project (CWP)
- 45 social work programs across 18 states

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSW</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>491</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates to date</td>
<td><strong>357</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross-site Evaluation Methods

• Students assessed at 3 time points (Stipend Student Inventory, or SSI)
  – Baseline
  – Annual
  – Follow-up

• Faculty and Field Competency Ratings

• Qualitative Data:
  – Student and Graduate interviews
  – Principal Investigator interviews
  – Student data tracking, narrative reports
Stipend Student Inventory (SSI)

Baseline

- Demographics
- Competency ratings

Annual

- Competency ratings
- Program, instructor, and field satisfaction
- Child welfare work readiness, preparedness, and commitment

Follow-up

- Competency ratings
- Organizational culture and climate (supervision, agency leadership, self-efficacy, time pressure, inclusivity, professional development, etc.)
- Impact of the work (job stress, coping, trauma)
- Child welfare work preparedness and commitment
Research Question:

• How successfully are NCWWI traineeships using recruitment strategies to increase the number of qualified and diverse applicants?
Ethnicity of NCWWI Trainees

- American Indian/Alaska Native: 1%
- Black/African American: 31%
- Hispanic/Latino: 15%
- White/Caucasian: 41%
- Other: 12%
Work Characteristics

Students
- Not working in CW, 58%
- Working in CW, 42%

Working Students
- Rural, 22%
- Urban, 68%
- Tribal, 10%

Graduates
- Working in CW, 76%
- Unemployed, 8%
- Other human services, 8%
- Graduate school, 8%
Research Question:

• How well are traineeship programs implementing innovative educational strategies that effectively prepare child welfare workers?
NCWWI Traineeships: Innovations

• Curriculum enhancements
• Field education improvements
• New course developments
• New inter-university and university-agency partnerships
• New resources:
  o Child Welfare Syllabi
  o Child Welfare Teaching Resources
  o Legacies & Lessons Learned
Student Satisfaction

Program Satisfaction

Field Satisfaction

---

**General Program Satisfaction**
- BSW students (n=143): 4.26
- MSW students (n=201): 4.21

**Instructional Content**
- BSW students (n=143): 5.22
- MSW students (n=201): 5.15

**Instructors**
- BSW students (n=143): 5.42
- MSW students (n=201): 5.30

**Field Placement Fit**
- BSW students (n=114): 4.47
- MSW students (n=177): 4.25

**Faculty Field Liaison**
- BSW students (n=114): 4.35
- MSW students (n=177): 3.99

**Field Instructor**
- BSW students (n=114): 4.37
- MSW students (n=177): 4.32
Research Question:

- To what extent are local child welfare issues impacted by and impacting education, training, and university – agency partnerships?
University-Agency Partnerships

• Most NCWWI traineeship PIs actively engaged with public and private agency partners
• Community of practice among the traineeship sites (facilitated by Michigan State University and Fordham University)
  – “Peer Networks”: conference calls/webinars, website and face-to-face meeting
  – Shared successes, challenges, strategies and approaches
Research Question:

• To what extent do traineeships prepare students with the knowledge and skills to work effectively in child welfare?
Child Welfare Competency Scale
56 items; EFA suggests 5-factor solution

- Human services structure & policy
  \( (\alpha = .90; 12 \text{ items}) \)

- Safety and risk
  \( (\alpha = .92; 8 \text{ items}) \)

- CW service delivery
  \( (\alpha = .92; 13 \text{ items}) \)

- CW practice skills
  \( (\alpha = .96; 18 \text{ items}) \)

- Culturally competent practice
  \( (\alpha = .84; 5 \text{ items}) \)
Competency Gains at Annual

- SSI: Baseline and Annual (2010 – 2013)
  - RM sample = 205 BSW & MSW students
  - Significant total competency score gains from baseline to annual at $p < .001$ for all students
  - No significant differences among cohorts
  - BSW students reported higher competency gains over time
Annual Competency Gains by Degree

![Graph showing annual competency gains by degree for BSW and MSW students.]

Baseline

Annual

- BSW Students (n=85)
- MSW Students (n=120)
Predictors of Student Readiness for Child Welfare Work: SCALE

• 5-item scale (α = .93)

- I feel that child protection is the right career for me
- I have the necessary knowledge and skills to be a successful child welfare professional
- I am committed to serving vulnerable children, youth, and families
- I am excited about applying my learning from my traineeship program to my job in child welfare
- I am ready to do what it takes to be a successful child welfare professional
# Predictors of Student Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>( B )</th>
<th>( SE )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequence 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Placement Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Placement Fit</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructors/Supervisors</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Content</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Instructors</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Perceptions of CW Work</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW Competency</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 \] \hspace{1cm} .39

\[ F \] \hspace{1cm} 29.00**

\( N = 279; \dagger < .05; *p \leq .01; **p \leq .001 \)
Expected Commitment to CW

A Service of the Children’s Bureau, a Member of the T/TA Network
Research Question:

• How are stipend students transferring their knowledge and skills to the workplace?
Competency Gains at Follow-up

- Repeated measures test of competencies over time
  - No differences between BSW and MSW graduates
  - Gains continued after graduation
  - Compared to baseline scores, competency scores were significantly higher:
    - At annual, $F(1,42) = 20.31, p < .001, \eta^2 = .35$
    - And at follow-up, $F(1,37) = 36.60, p < .001, \eta^2 = .50$
Research Question:

• What are the factors that influence job retention beyond the obligation period?
Graduate Demographics

- **White/Caucasian, 46%**
- **Black/African American, 34%**
- **Hispanic/Latino, 15%**
- **American Indian/Alaska Native, 5%**

BSW Grads: 168
MSW Grads: 189
Graduate Work Characteristics

- Working in CW, 76%
- Graduate school, 8%
- Unemployed, 8%
- Other human services, 8%
- Federal, 1%
- Tribal agencies, 2%
- Public & private agencies, 18%
- Private agencies, 15%
- Public agencies, 61%
Findings from Graduates

• All working graduates reported high levels of job stress (amount/intensity of work)
  – Peer support helped grads cope with stress

• For working graduates who carried caseloads:
  – Higher vicarious trauma and secondary traumatic stress (STSS, defined as the emotional duress that results when an individual hears about firsthand trauma experiences of another)
  – Fewer coping strategies
### Predictors of Graduates’ STS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Child Welfare</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.90**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 125; \ *p < .05; **p < .01$
# Predictors of Graduates’ Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Education</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Vision</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.14†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.80**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 125; \ ^{†}p < .10; \ ^{*}p < .05; \ ^{**}p < .01$
## Predictors of Graduates’ Intent to Stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Knowledge</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarious Trauma</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.48**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 125; *p < .05; **p < .01
The LAMM

**Goal:** Enhance ability of middle managers to apply leadership skills for implementation of sustainable systems change through 5-day residential training supported by coaching and peer networking.

**Delivery:** 3 times each in Dallas, Denver, Seattle, New York, and Philadelphia (2 deliveries were pilots & not counted in evaluation)
Major LAMM Evaluation Findings

• LAMM participants demonstrated significant competency gains from baseline to post-training assessment that persist a full year after training
• Participants who showed the highest learning gains were more likely to implement change
• Participants who sought coaching and peer support were more likely to implement change
• Motivation and work environment supports predicted transfer of learning
Theory-Driven Training Model

Lamm Training Supports:

Before Training
- Individualized Coaching
- Training Introduction
- Online Module
- Strengths-based Leadership Assessment

During Training
- Individualized and Group Coaching
- Peer-to-Peer Learning
- Online Resources Catalogue

After Training
- Individualized Coaching
- Peer Networks
- Online Resources Catalogue
- Workforce Webinars

Goals of the LAMM:
- Improved Outcomes for Children, Youth, and Families
- Sustainable Systems Change
- Adaptive, Distributive, Inclusive Leadership Skills
LAMM Evaluation Design

Mixed Methods Approach

• Survey Battery: Pre, Post, Follow-up (3, 6, and 12 months)
  – Leadership Competencies
  – Change Initiative (CI) Implementation
  – Workplace Implementation Supports
  – Transfer of Learning
  – Peer Outreach and Networking
  – Coaching (one-on-one, post-training)

• Qualitative Approaches
  – Survey open-ended responses, 6-month interviews
Participant Demographics

- **Female,** 81%
- **Male,** 19%
- **White,** 63%
- **Black or AA,** 13%
- **AI or AN,** 14%
- **Hispanic,** 6%
- **BSW,** 6%
- **MSW,** 38%
- **MA or higher,** 65%
Participants’ Geographic Locations
Evaluation Participation

• Total sample includes all 406 managers across the 13 training cohorts
  – Evaluation response rates range from 97% to 99% at pre-post and from 63% to 79% at follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-training</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-training</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Month</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Month</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Month</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Questions:

• To what extent are participants reporting that they are learning the leadership competencies addressed in the training modules?

• How are participants transferring their knowledge and skills to the workplace?
Developmental Competencies

- Measuring leadership competency
  - Initially 32 items, then reduced to 28 items
  - Learning
  - Transfer of Learning
Overall Competency Gains Over Time

Change in Overall Leadership Competencies from Pre-test to 12-month Follow-up

- Pre to Post change: $F(1, 390) = 1480.86, p < .001, \eta^2 = .79$
- Pre to 12-month FU change: $F(4, 155) = 180.44, p < .001, \eta^2 = .82$
LAMM Leadership Competencies

• Original scale: 32 items (administered to 6 cohorts), then reduced to 28 items (administered to 7 cohorts)

• EFA = 2-factor solution with 25 items
  – Leadership Skills
    • \( \alpha = .87 \) to \( .90 \) across time points
  – Change Initiative Implementation Efficacy
    • \( \alpha = .84 \) to \( .94 \) across time points
Leadership Skills & Change Initiative Implementation Efficacy

Leadership Skills

CI Implementation Efficacy

Pre | Post | 3 months | 6 months

Non-tribal (n=215) | Tribal (n=23)

Non-tribal (n=214) | Tribal (n=22)
LAMM Change Initiatives’ Implementation Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Installation</th>
<th>Initial Implementation</th>
<th>Full Implementation</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Months</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Months</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question:

• What factors are facilitators or barriers to transfer of learning?
Success of Efforts to Promote Transfer of Learning

- **Resource packets** were prepared for all LAMM participants. 40% report using the packets, and 50% of those found them very helpful.
- 292 (72%) of LAMM participants reached out to cohort peers, through email or phone.
- 90 managers (22%) received between 1-14 individual coaching sessions and almost 90% reported it very helpful.
Effect of Supports - Change Implementation

![Graph showing the effect of supports on change implementation over time. The graph compares pretest, posttest, 3-mo FU, 6-mo FU, and 12-mo FU for training and training plus any support. The graph shows a significant increase in scores from pretest to posttest for both groups, with training plus any support maintaining a higher score than training alone at all subsequent follow-up points.](image)
Barriers to Implementing Change

• Competing interests and changing priorities
• Getting buy-in & maintaining motivation over time
• Managing turnover (both at workforce and leadership levels)
• Accessing resources

“The biggest [challenge] is always the adaptive piece, looking at the big picture and somehow really communicating that and the vision to your staff and to all your stakeholders in a way that just really gets their attention and that they have the same passion and urgency.”
Facilitators for Implementing Change

- Ongoing support, coaching and feedback from leadership
- External coaching opportunities
- Discussing challenges and strategies with peers
- Focused time and attention on skill development and change

“The greatest success has been being able to actually start putting some of the theory into practice … Now, the CQI unit has been able to start moving forward – researching other states’ systems, conducting focus groups, getting input from staff, etc.”
LAMM Predictors: Change Implementation

- Individual Ability
- Motivation to Transfer
- Preparedness from Training
- Work Environment

3-month Change Implementation

6-month Change Implementation

Correlations:
- 0.29**
- 0.12*
LAMM Predictors: Leadership Skills

- Individual Ability
- Motivation to Transfer
- Preparedness from Training
- Work Environment

3-month Leadership Skills

6-month Leadership Skills

Correlation Coefficients:
- \( r = 0.30^{**} \)
- \( r = 0.14^{*} \)
- \( r = 0.18^{*} \)
- \( r = 0.14^{*} \)
LEADERSHIP ACADEMY FOR SUPERVISORS:
Evaluation Findings
LAS Training Model

- National online training for experienced supervisors
- Blended learning design
Major LAS Evaluation Findings

- LAS participants demonstrated significant competency gains from baseline to post-training assessment that persist a full year after training.
- Participants who showed the highest learning gains and who had a supportive work environment were more likely to implement change.
- Key to retaining supervisors in online training is peer support through cohort model, supervisor support, and workplace supports for using NCWWI Leadership Model on the job.
Participant Demographics

- White/Caucasian, 69%
- Black/African American, 23%
- Hispanic/Latino, 3%
- American Indian/Alaska Native, 2%
- Other, 3%

Education Levels:
- BA/BS: 41%
- MSW: 27%
- MA/MS: 18%
- BSW: 8%
- Other: 4%
- High School/GED: 1%
- Associate's Degree: 1%

Average Years in:
- Current Position: 5
- Organization: 11.9
- Child Welfare: 14.6
LAS Participation

- LAS launched in 2009 with national and state coordinated models
  - Participation and completion rates differed dramatically
  - National LASLNs discontinued in 2012
- Over 800 supervisors participated in CORE modules
  - 330 participants in state cohorts
    - 17 state cohorts in 10 different states
    - AL, CO, HI, IL, IN, NY, OK, SC, TN, VT
  - 53 participants in national cohorts
    - 3 National Cohorts and 1 Tribal cohort ($N = 7$, discontinued)
  - 425 self-directed participants
LAS Evaluation Design

• Mixed Methods Approach
  – Survey: Pre, Post, Follow-up (3, 6, and 12 months)
    • Leadership Competencies
    • Change Initiative (CI) Implementation
    • Personal Learning Plan
    • Transfer of Learning

• Qualitative Approaches
  – Interviews with State Cohort participants and stakeholders
  – Interviews with graduates of the National Cohort
  – Case study with student taking LAS for credit
LAS Evaluation Participation

- Total sample includes 854 supervisors across survey instruments
  - Pre-post surveys accessed through online training modules
  - Follow-up surveys anchored by start date for Foundations of Leadership module

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-training</td>
<td>333-517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-training</td>
<td>159-557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Month</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Month</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Month</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAS Participant Satisfaction

• Satisfaction across modules
  – 3.88 to 4.06 on 5-point scale

• Higher satisfaction among self-directed national cohorts

“This is a great model. It is changing the way I think. I have been focused on improving myself for me. I understand now that I need to improve to help others improve. Thanks for this opportunity.”

“This is a great leadership training. However it is difficult to complete when working full time, have high caseloads as well as shortage in staff.”
Satisfaction by Module

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>State*</th>
<th>Self/National*</th>
<th>Combined Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Module</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations of Leadership</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading in Context</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading People</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading for Results</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading for Change</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Questions:

• To what extent are participants reporting that they are learning the leadership competencies addressed in the training modules?

• How are LAS participants transferring their knowledge and skills to the workplace?
Pre-Post Competency Gains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundations of Leadership (n=257)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading in Context (n=166)</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading People (n=104)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading for Results (n=139)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading for Change (n=119)</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average Competencies by Module & Timepoint

- Foundations of Leadership
- Leading in Context
- Leading People
- Leading for Results
- Leading for Change

Graph shows average competencies across different timepoints (Pre, Post, 3-month, 6-month, 12-month) for each module.
Personal Learning Plan (PLP)

![Graph showing Personal Learning Plans over time with points at 3 months (3.75), 6 months (3.82), and 12 months (3.98).]
Change Initiative Implementation over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question:

• What factors are facilitators or barriers to transfer of learning?
Facilitators & Barriers: Qualitative Data

**Facilitators**

- Strategic blocking of time during work hours to complete modules
- Active support from manager
- Collaboration with peers

**Barriers**

- Extensive time demands
- No dedicated time in the office to do the work
- Lack of permission/support from manager
- Carrying a caseload
# Differing Levels of Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PERMISSION</strong></th>
<th><strong>LIMITED SUPPORT</strong></th>
<th><strong>FULL SUPPORT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager aware of participation and may allow work time for LAS</td>
<td>Manager allows office time to complete, may ask about deadlines/completion</td>
<td>Full interest in the process, coaching and mentoring about application of concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When he/she was asked to ask us about it, he/she did.</td>
<td>We talked about superficial things – whether I was meeting the deadlines, how far along I was in it – but not about the content.</td>
<td>My supervisor and I talked a lot about it, where I was with it, how it was going. At monthly management meetings we talked about what we learned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAS Predictors: Change Implementation (3 and 6 months)

- Work Environment
- Motivation to Transfer
- Personal Ability
- Competencies

3-month Predictors:
- Work Environment: 0.25**
- Motivation to Transfer: 0.15†

6-month Predictors:
- Personal Ability: 0.47**
- Competencies: 0.61**

Change Implementation
KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT & DISSEMINATION:
Evaluation Findings

Changing . . .
Leading . . .
Learning . . .
Major Outputs

• Screened 750+ resources and uploaded 300+ to Online Resource Library
• Developed more than 300 different products, including 110 E-resource packets, 10 National eUpdates & 25 1-pg literature summaries.
• Grew national distribution list from 900 to 22,000.
• Hosted successful National Webinar Series
KAM & DISS Evaluation Findings

• High usage of NCWWI materials, tools and products as well as website (1000 visits per month)

• Highly effective marketing and research strategies as evidenced by National Webinar Series’ participation

• High satisfaction among external stakeholder groups

• Used evaluation findings to modify strategies to reach various audiences in most effective way
Evaluation Design

• Mixed Methods Approach
  – Web-based surveys of LAMM, LAS and Traineeship participants
  – Surveys of national webinar series’ registrants
  – Monitoring of all activities, website visits, and outputs
  – Qualitative interviews with NCWWI participants, NCWWI team members and external stakeholders
National Webinar Series: What Works for the Workforce

• Showcased child welfare workforce innovations and strategies, and accompanying leadership competencies
• Hosted 12 sessions and 12 follow-up learning labs between September 2010 and September 2013
• Implemented comprehensive strategic marketing plan
Webinar Registration & Participation

• 9204 unique registrants across all webinars/learning labs

• Webinars: averaged 1218 registrants/1089 participants

• Learning Labs: averaged 150 registrants/63 participants

• Archived webinars have been viewed an average of 262 times and reached 37 different countries
Webinar Series Satisfaction

![Webinar Satisfaction Chart]

Webinars:
1. (n=232) 4.05
2. (n=211) 4.03
3. (n=294) 3.84
4. (n=311) 3.86
5. (n=471) 3.92
6. (n=208) 3.84
7. (n=630) 3.90
8. (n=188) 3.86
9. (n=333) 3.94
10. (n=494) 3.95
11. (n=355) 3.94
12. (n=232) 3.90
Lessons Learned, Questions & Future Connections
Lessons Learned: NCWWI Efforts

• Critical elements for success of a training program:
  – Competency-based training and assessment
  – Training fit and delivery
  – Workforce supports such as coaching/mentoring, peer and supervisor support and an agency climate that supports continuous learning

• Integrated efforts across an agency that are internally driven are needed to effectively build leadership and develop the workforce
Lessons Learned: Future Evaluation Efforts

• Built a strong foundation for training evaluation with valid and reliable competency measures and predictive TOL measures that were theory-driven

• Next steps: Tie NCWWI interventions to individual and agency performance outcomes, and to client outcomes

• Continue longitudinal assessment of traineeship graduates to follow their career trajectories
Questions?

1. Previously submitted questions from webinar registrants

2. Questions from participants on the web platform
Closing & Future Connections

• **Upcoming Sessions in Our Making a Difference Webinar Mini-series**
  1. *Traineeships Legacies & Lessons Learned* - April 22, 2014
  3. *LAS Legacies & Lessons Learned* – June 2014

• **Closing the Gap National Webinar Series**
  – Begins Fall 2014

• **Social Media:**
  – Twitter: [twitter.com/NCWWI](http://twitter.com/NCWWI) (hashtag #NCWWI)
  – Facebook: [facebook.com/workforceinstitute](http://facebook.com/workforceinstitute)