

2016 UCEDD TA Institute Enriching Cultural Efforts: What's in Your Toolbox? March 3 - 4, 2016

Session Notes

Theme: Performance Measurement

Objective: Establish guidance and measure progress toward diversity, inclusion, and cultural and linguistic competence.

Facilitator: Wendy Parent-Johnson

General Notes/ Big Takeaways:

Things that are easy to measure aren't things that measure outcomes or impact. Also need to find a way to measure the long processes of building relationships over time, and what the impact is.

Layers – staff, organizations, community.

Strategies Shared:

Identify what the steps are to building relationships – the relationship is a short-term outcome that can be measured through the steps it takes to build it.

Use framework of logic model (short-term, long term outcomes).

Be intentional – identify and measure the things we do to get to where we want to go.

Health policy colleagues use the term “convening” – people coming together for an exchange.

Identify aspects of reciprocity.

Triple aim used by CMS is one measure is to improve experience of people in system of care. It considers health, care, and cost. Consider following this model. More

info: <http://content.healthaffairs.org/content/27/3/759.full>

Quantifying approaches comes from dominant US culture – it is not the way community members think about their neighborhoods, family, community. If the only reason we're building a relationship is to measure it, then we are not truly building a relationship. Quantifying approaches is not a culturally

competent approach to building relationships in communities – qualitative aspects is better (convening, reciprocity, engagement).

Individual measures are the most critical – engagement, civility, satisfaction.

Quality of life survey follows people's experience of life over time – looking at whether someone's life has gotten any better.

When working with agencies providing TA over time, evaluation is to help document what was done, and also how the TA created impact, and identify that impact. Can do this with community groups.

Create tools that document satisfaction addressing elements of relationships.

Develop workgroup to identify measures for network.

Why are we doing this? Performance measurement and monitoring? Sharing approaches for TA purposes? Be clear about why we are doing this, before moving forward.

Identify how relationships are going.

Identify which communities relationships are with...or not. Ex, no relationships in homeless community. Can task staff to just go hang out. But for what purpose? Need accountability for staff time – notes for internal use only which over time, can paint picture of what it takes to build relationship.

We make decisions based on data we are collecting, which may not be true measurement of what we're doing. Ex: can measure that folks were invited and didn't come, then how do we measure how the invitation was made, and whether the invitation was made in the manner the community receives.

Formal and informal community. Ex: formal: Churches have organized relationship in community. Anyone can go see what churches are doing re: their social service activities by talking with pastor. Informal: be in the church, grocery store, etc. talking with the people living in the community. Folks won't know the UCEDD but will know the university.

Ethical issues exist as we are in communities. When we establish relationship, be with people, create listening session. Consider history of outreach and abandonment. What are ethical dilemmas as we

hear people's needs? What's our obligation to continue in that dialogue? Have full picture of state but only address some of the problems? How do we reconcile those issues?

Participating in things that already exist, not trying to take over.

In development of the current UCEDD Network logic model, we recognized that we couldn't quantify everything. Couldn't pack the outcomes we are trying to measure into numbers, into NIRS. Determined that final 5-year reports would be more qualitative information.

Separate issues of diversity, cultural competence, relationship building. We know very little of how diversity of staff gets to cultural competence. Or relationship building. Determining merits of these things can help decide what to value. Pragmatically, we will still have to count things, but should be in context of relationship building, cultural competence.

How do we integrate staff performance measures? This crosses into some sections of the infrastructure objective.

UCEDDs may be restricted to the performance measurement model of university human resources office. But UCEDD can set goals such as: demonstrate sensitivity, establish relationships, etc.

Qualitative measures and feedback – staff have to find 3-5 people they've worked with in the community, supervisor answers 2 questions about how staff worked with them and how it helped them.

360 evaluation of staff performance. Helps create culture of safe space in office. Can be used internally AND externally re: relationships with others in the community.

CAC adopted principles of partnerships. OK conducted round-robin assessment of how they did, peer accountability in small groups and then plenary.

On projects where we have certain numbers to meet, things to do...when we get down to the wire, these community engagement and culturally competence issues go out the window as heightened focus on meeting numbers or other goals. To avoid this, ensure that diversity and cultural competence issues are among the goals that must be met.

Continue to remind federal partners that this topic doesn't lend itself appropriately to quantification.

In NIRS, create new area of emphasis that addresses racial disparities, diversity. It tends to get lumped under other areas of emphasis. It already is, though.

Our PPR report on collaboration is all narrative, not even truly qualitative – is just descriptive. Consider this approach for this topic.

Suggest ongoing conversation – a mechanism to continue talking.

Are there fields in NIRS where folks are writing about this info in NIRS? AIDD can fund an evaluative study of this info across UCEDDs to identify what is being done, what folks are struggling with. Need identifier in NIRS such as keyword so that national searches can be done to identify every activity happening in the network regarding this topic.

This is a topic where you never actually “get there.”

How much do you do, how good do you do it? How many new relationships have you built – this can be counted. Define relationship – reciprocity. How well you do it – get info from the folks you're in the relationship with.

What we're expected/required to report on should give freedom to count efforts that are or are not successful.

Consider framework of building capacity. Professional development of own staff should also address things such as relationship-building (rather than just professional discipline skill-building), ex: listening, presence in others' spaces, and such.

One indicator of more sustained quality is sustained organizational relationships – in community, in trainees, in faculty. Number hired, and number who stay 5 years, are different numbers. LEND guidance this year did address longevity of relationships re: academic relationships.

Train staff on relationship-building in community, then measure staff on their relationship-building in their own communities.

Consider adding staff development as a type of activity in NIRS to capture UCEDD efforts in training staff in these areas. (group was not all in agreement on this idea)

Process of developing relationships, and all the activities that lead to a strong relationship, are quantifiable and are of value. Very descriptive, narrative.

Data point: where you are located, how many communities you have presence in and increasing that. Relationships may be transitory; outreach must be constant.

What info are folks asking for from AUCD, AIDD? A common question: who is working with _____ population?

What is the Office of Minority health measuring in their funded programs? Or Health People 2020?

Tools for pre-/post-assessment. Ex: all staff are required to receive training (might be self-learning module) and score at least ____, and if not, must receive remedial training.

Individual and organizational self-assessment. Two levels of review.

LEND had required organizational self-assessment on cultural competence in years past – what was that?

How will these conversations be sent to Diversity Leadership Institute?

IPEDS – integrated postsecondary education data is a possible source of data from IES on the diversity of faculty and students in accredited universities.

How to capture rich activities that are going on around the network, to share with all?

Where do we find data on number of people with disabilities entering higher education? Do common core standards have impact on PWD going to college, addressing that aspect of diversity?

Re NIRS: no standard criteria for which faculty/staff are entered in NIRS. Is very variable.

Resources or Contact Persons:

AEA conference – people from all over the world come. Some great qualitative measures from all over the world. Will be in Atlanta, GA in October 24-29, 2016: <http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=395>

Michael Striven and Jane Davidson write about evaluative thinking – determining the merit of something. Are our outcomes, activities of value?

Turning Point: <http://www.rwjf.org/en/library/research/2005/01/to-improve-health-and-health-care-volume-viii/the-turning-point-initiative.html>

AEA statement on cultural competence: <http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=92>

Repositioning validity: <http://falk.syr.edu/Documents/2013/RepositioningValidity.pdf>

OMH performance measures: <http://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/omh/browse.aspx?lvl=2&lvlid=14>

Follow-up?:

- Ilka Riddle (OH-Cinn) shared: “In our division, faculty members participate in a 360 Evaluation. Our division director (admin assistant) asks us to provide 5-8 names and email addresses of people who can provide feedback on us. We always include internal and external people, including our community members, in the list of contacts. Once the division has the names and emails of the people I chose, I send them all an email, telling them that they will receive an email from my division asking for feedback on me. I always stress the importance of participation and for them to provide honest feedback. My contacts will then receive a monkeysurvey survey that states the following:

Ilka Riddle has selected you as an individual to provide 360 feedback to be included in the 2015 performance evaluation process. Participation is anonymous.

We appreciate your taking time to participate in our short survey.

Thank you!

DDBP Leadership

LINK TO SURVEY

The three questions are open ended:

- 1.) *Please tell us about the strengths of the faculty member. Be specific and provide examples, if possible.*
- 2.) *Please tell us areas for improvement of the faculty member. Be specific and provide examples, if possible.*
- 3.) *Please tell us about the professionalism of the faculty member. Be specific and provide examples, if possible.*

People send their feedback back via the surveymonkey survey to our division director/admin assistant of the division director. The feedback gets integrated with all other feedback and shared during the performance evaluation meeting.”

- Valerie Williams (OK) shared: “The “Seven Partner Values” are on our website: <http://ouhsc.edu/thecenter/cac/>. The discussions about diversity have all been at the CAC meetings. We don’t keep CAC “minutes” -- we do a written agenda plus a post meeting feedback/evaluation form (and discussion) for each meeting asking about how meeting went. We revisit the previous meeting feedback summary at the start of each CAC so all members know what concerns, if any were raised and how all members fared during the previous meeting. The CAC co-chairs, Vice chair and key CAC staff meet ahead to go over agenda, activity and feedback from previous mtg. We started this process many years ago and have built on it over time so pulling one coherent series of agendas together will require a little digging on my part. Happy to dig up our stuff- we had a lot of discussion and some fun learning together that helped build our CAC cohesion and fellowship.”
 - See pdf: CAC_ROADMAP_slides_Oct09_update_Oct2010-vw2.pdf