

**Research and Evaluation Committee Meeting  
Minutes  
8/6/15 1PM**

**Attendance**

	Present	Absent
*Jennifer Funderburk	x	
*Jennifer Hodgson		X
*Jeff Goodie		X
*Jodi Polaha	X	
*Jennifer Wray	x	
*Zephon Lister		X
Rusty Kallenberg	X	
Astrid Beigel	x	
Ian Bennett		X
Bill McFeature		X
Tom Bishop		X
Brian DeSantis	X	
C R Macchi		X
Christine Runyan		X
Chris Hunter		X
Colleen Cordes		X
Danielle King		X
David Johnson	X	
Emma Gilchrist		X
Gary		X
Jeri Turgesen		X
Jessica Pittrizzi		X
Karen Kinman		X
Polly Kurtz	X	
Lesley Mason		X
Katilin Lilenthal		X
Lori Zeman		X
Mark Vogel		X
Mary Peterson		X
Mary Talen		X
Matthew Tolliver		X
Tawnya Meadows		X
Miyoung Yoon Hammer		X
Beth Nolan	X	
Patrick Palmieri		X
Randi Dublin		X
Robyn Shepardson	X	
Stacy Ogbeide		X
Christina Studts		X
Suzanne Daub		X
Will Lusenhop		X
Kathryn Woods		X
Rodger Kessler	X	
Joe Grasso		X
Kaitlin Lilienthal		X
Nyann Biery		X
Jessie Purcel	X	

**\* voting member**

## Approval of Minutes from 6/4/15.

Move to approve: move to approve, will do this over email due to lack of voting members

### 1. Training in Research & Evaluation track of CFHA conference

- a. Discussed subcommittee on evaluating the R&E conference track. Their ideas are included at bottom of this agenda.
  - i. Conference attendees get several evaluations throughout conference so we don't want to overburden them
  - ii. Polly suggested we either combine research & eval track surveys with the yellow half sheet already given to attendees or use our own and the conference foregoes the yellow half sheet
  - iii. Committee agreed that paper and pencil surveys in the room would be the best method (as opposed to online survey)- vote on this via email among voting members
  - iv. The survey looks good to go- will edit the surveys based on feedback from the committee before finalizing
- b. Publishing papers that appear in research track in special issue in Family Systems & health—
  - i. Jen and Jodi will meet next week with the journal editors to find out what the next steps are to help move this along- but it will be happening!
- c. Market our research & eval track—Subcommittee- Jen H, Jodi, Jen F
  - i. Identify ways we can market the research & eval track -see findings below
  - ii. Beth has agreed to do the webinar in September! (week of Sept 23)
    1. Polly can mention the track while introducing Beth
    2. Jen F and/or Jodi talk for a few minutes at the end of the webinar to put in an explicit plug for the track
  - iii. Email that the subcommittee drafted to send out to people who may be interested in attending in the area is below- voting members will vote through email
  - iv. Idea about giving track completers a certificate
    1. Could give everyone the certificate via email- Jen F offered to have her RAs create this
    2. What would be the criteria for earning the certificate? Maybe 2/5 this first year to see how it goes?
    3. Would encourage people to put their email address on the back of the first survey
  - v. Idea of having one hour consultation post-track with research/program evaluation experts
    1. Do we have the time/resources to pull this together for this year?
    2. Can we use feedback from the surveys to decide if we want to do this next year
    3. Committee thought it would be better to include this next year if at all

- vi. Short promotional video that could be shown e.g., in between sessions, preconference
  - 1. TO DO: Jodi and Jen Hodgson will put something like this together for the Sept meeting so the committee can give feedback
  - 2. The concept for the video would be to have kids talking about why people should attend the R&E track
  - 3. If committee members are interested in helping out we are looking for kids to participate! Email Jodi if you are willing to have your child(ren) participate- it would just involve taking a short video of them with a tagline and sending it to Jodi

## **2. Requests for CFHA conference**

- a. Request from Polly: “We are putting together an interactive art display for this year’s conference. It will feature around 500 colorful buttons, each containing a word or brief phrase that describes integrated behavioral healthcare. Attendees will be able to walk up to the display and pick out their favorite button and (we’re hoping!) wear/display it throughout the conference. We’re thinking these little one-word/ brief phrase buttons will spark a dialogue between conference attendees and serve as a platform for additional conversation between newcomers and conference veterans. Obviously with 500 buttons, we’d like to have a long list of descriptive words to choose from. Here’s where I need your assistance. I’m hoping that each of you could set aside about 5-7 minutes in your next SIG/committee meetings to brainstorm some words to add to our list. The prompt is “IBH is:” and here’s an example of some responses: Teamwork, Patient-centered, Challenging, Growing, new, Change, Innovative, Difficult, Barriers, Collaboration”
  - i. Demonstrating impact, Evidence based
  - ii. Ran out of time to discuss- email committee members to generate more ideas
- b. We’d like to offer each of you the opportunity to include some marketing material in our conference packets. Each committee and SIG will get ½ page (back and front) 8.5” x5.5” to use as you wish (for member recruitment, conference session identification, etc.) This is a great way to inform our attendees about your SIG/committee or let them know about certain conference sessions/plenaries that highlight your group’s mission. Please send a formatted ½ page (you can use the front and back) to me by August 31, 2015. If you have any questions, please let me know.

## **3. CFHA abstracts/reviewer process**

- a. Plan for giving feedback to CFHA based on our conversation at last meeting?
  - i. Tabled

## **4. Fellowship application update**

- a. Announced that Jen Wray won the fellowship award
- b. Will include her abstract in next meeting agenda

- c. Committee members will provide feedback to applicants on their proposals to help strength

**5. In person meeting in October during the conference**

- a. There has been time set aside Saturday morning of conference (7:30-9) for SIGs, committees to meet – no conference activities will be scheduled during this time
- b. One issue is that several attendees are involved on multiple committees

To do: how do we want to use this meeting time? Let's talk about this during Sept meeting

**6. Brian DeSantis will share a research idea and solicit feedback from the group**

- a. Will table for Sept meeting

**7. Next meeting:** Will take a poll from committee members via email due to labor day weekend potentially causing a conflict

---

**Supplemental materials:**

Subcommittee #1 (evaluation of research track) findings:

1. Observations:
  - a. Few people actually attend an entire track at a conference, most look through program and pick and choose presentations that interest them
  - b. In order to evaluate the whole track, the survey would have to be given on the second half of the last day which may not capture as many people as we would like
  - c. Should evaluation of the track be limited to individuals who only attended the whole track, which would be unlikely (See first observation)?
  - d. Having participants complete more than one survey may also reduce response rates.
2. Conclusions: Based on these observations, it was concluded that it would not be likely that many people would attend every presentation in the research/evaluation track and that to wait to the end of the conference to ask people to complete a survey or only survey individuals who attended the whole track about their experience would have low yield.
3. Recommendation:

- a. To integrate a paper evaluation with the typical CFHA presentation evaluations (see attached)
- b. Use participant id# to identify participants that attended 2 or more presentations and pullout the surveys for further analysis of research/evaluation track and potential follow-up
- c. Conduct follow-up assessment via electronic survey (J. Funderburk has offered use of psychdata.com)

Draft of survey:

1. How relevant was this presentation to the research/program evaluation/quality improvement needs of your job position or organization?

Not at all relevant     Slightly relevant     Moderately relevant     Very relevant     Completely relevant

2. Did you have a question or current/future project in mind when you decided to attend this presentation?  Yes     No

If yes, how well did the presentation answer or further develop ideas/plans for your project?

Yes     Partially     No

3. How likely are you to implement information presented in this presentation to a current/future project at your job position or organization?

Not at all likely     Slightly likely     Moderately likely     Very likely     Completely likely

4. What information from the presentations you have attended from the research track will you plan to implement at your job or organization?

- 4.5. Could we contact you in 4-6 weeks via email to ask how you are implementing some of the information presented during the CFHA research/evaluation track? Yes    No

If yes, ~~would you~~ please provide your preferred email where we could send a brief survey:

\_\_\_\_\_

**Follow Up Survey and/or Interview Questions:**

1. Looking back at the presentations you attended in the research/evaluation track at CFHA, how effective was the track in providing useful information about developing the skills and tools needed for developing and implementing research/program evaluation/quality improvement projects?

Not at all effective     Slightly effective     Moderately effective     Very effective     Completely effective

2. How likely would it be for you to recommend the CFHA research/evaluation track to someone looking to develop skills and tools for developing and implementing research/evaluation/quality improvement projects?

Not at all likely     Slightly likely     Moderately likely     Very likely     Completely likely

3. Since the CFHA conference, have you utilized any of the information you learned during the research/evaluation track for any current or upcoming research/program evaluation/quality improvement projects?  Yes     No

If yes, ~~would you please~~ describe what information you took away from the CFHA conference research/track and how you are utilizing it.

4. ~~Are there things that you found~~ What did you find particularly useful/helpful about the CFHA research/evaluation track? ~~If yes, what?~~

5. Reflecting on the CFHA research/evaluation track, ~~how do -are there ways that~~ you think the track could have been improved? ~~If yes, what?~~

6. ~~Are there~~What things/topics that you would want incorporated into the research/evaluation track at CFHA in the future? If yes, what?
7. What aspects of the information presented during the research track sessions do you think you will actually implement in your position or organization?

RESEARCH COMMITTEE TO DO: Please review the above recommended process and survey and provide feedback to Jennifer.Wray@va.gov by Monday August 3th so we can integrate the responses for the committee call.

**Feedback from committee members:**

~~5-6.~~ On “ CFHA Research Evaluation, Track Survey” I suggest that question 2, that you leave out for “If Yes” “how well. So it would say :

If yes, did the presentation further develop .....

Yes, Partially, No.

I think it is less confusing if the “how well” is left out.

~~6-7.~~ I agree that people won’t attend the whole track and people will leave the conference early, so we should not wait until the end to evaluate. If we can squeeze our questions in on the same page as the main CFHA evaluation sheet that everyone does, that is awesome.

~~7-8.~~ Add one question at the end of the survey asking participants: What information from the presentations you have attended from the research track will plan to implement at your job or organization?

~~8-9.~~ Use “extremely relevant” instead of “completely relevant”

~~9-10.~~ Consider moving items 1 and 2 from follow up survey to the first survey (however, space will probably be limited and perhaps the rationale is to give people time to reflect and see if they actually use the info?)

Subcommittee #2 findings

1. Webinar – Beth Nolan will be presenting on program evaluation, quality improvement, and research in September.
2. Email blast (to be consistent with #3 below); however, perhaps the research committee could target the local universities (within 3-5 hours drive) to see whether others might be interested.

**Draft of email:**

(personal greeting if research committee member knows someone at organization or university)

The Collaborative Family Health Association ([CFHA](#)) announces a **new** Research and Evaluation track at the 2015 CFHA Conference in Portland, Oregon. We hope some representatives from your organization will attend.

Demonstrating patient outcomes, service delivery and cost effectiveness, by engaging in ongoing quality improvement ~~has a growing significance~~ is increasingly important in the modern health care landscape. This track is designed provide practical “how to” lessons for key representatives in your organization regarding how to plan and conduct research, quality improvement, and program evaluation in ~~a~~ real-world health care settings.

The proposals included in this track are:

(insert titles of presentations and brief abstracts)

For further information about other presentations at the conference or interest in registering to attend a day or the entire conference, please review the Collaborative Family Healthcare Association website at: [www.cfha.net](http://www.cfha.net)

3. A special certificate for those who attend X of 5 research track presentations (need to come up with a cool title, research track completers is not interesting) . AND, possibly, for those who attend X of 5, we also offer a one-hour consultative phone call with one of our members to help them devise a plan to put their learning to use. We were thinking if people could "sell" the certificate to their organizations that they were going to this conference to get specialized program eval/QI/research training to bring back (including the individualized piece) it might have some sway. The key here would be to market this widely - so people "get it" up front and then of course we have to make sure we can track what people attend and figure out a way to match them with a member for the consultative piece. Altogether it would be like 6 hrs or research training...
4. Making little 1" diameter buttons with a tiny catchy word or short phrase on them. They could be handed out to anyone who attends our track. They to this with a SIG at ABCT and the buttons really generate a little buzz. I have a friend w a button maker and I can ask her about making these.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE TO DO: Please review the above suggestions and provide feedback to Jennifer.Wray@va.gov by Monday August 3th so we can integrate the responses for the committee call. This includes any cool names for the certificates that you can think of. Or changes to the email that will be used to send out to local universities and organizations.

**Feedback from committee members:**

~~10-11.~~ I think it is important to refer throughout as **program evaluation, quality improvement, and research** and not just as research.

~~11-12.~~ As for the certificate, I am not totally sold on it but it could help drum up attendance, as people could put it on their CV and they would probably like that aspect. But I'd make it maybe 4 hours at least. I thought there were 6 talks, but maybe there is only 5. Hopefully these talks are completely spread out in the program, not overlapping at all – otherwise that will be a huge problem

| ~~12.13.~~ It's a great idea to do special outreach to local universities to see if people will be interested in attending. I would suggest they include staff at Oregon FQHCs and that type of thing as administrators might want training in program evaluation. Probably best to do the outreach while the early bird rate is still being offered.