



ARCH Data Collection Workgroup Meeting

January 11, 2018

Casandra Firman, ARCH
Heather Menne, ACL

Today's Call Agenda

2

Brief review of aims, concept, and process

Brief recap of the last meeting's activities and actions.

Group discussion and initial recommendations on outcomes 2 and 3.



Workgroup Aim, Concept and Process

3

Aim

- To identify a set of data elements and data collection protocols that will be a future requirement of all Lifespan Respite Grantees.

Concept

- To achieve our aim, active participation of Lifespan Respite grantees, ARCH staff, and ACL staff will help ensure appropriate data are collected to demonstrate effectiveness and that the expectations for data collection are reasonable and achievable for all grantees.

Process

- Through a series of web-meetings, conference calls, and email exchanges, the team will draft, review, and finalize data collection protocols to be field-tested in the late spring of 2018.

Recap of last meeting's activities and actions.

The group reviewed the following outcome and suggested indicators:

4

Grantees achieve the goals identified in their proposal *as indicated by:*

- 1.1 By the end of the funding period, grantees meet the goals and objectives identified in their proposal.
- 1.2 Semi-annually, grantees document progress towards the achievement of their outcomes.

The group agreed the outcome was reasonable and measurable.

Two methods for measurement were considered by the group. One, a binary tool for recording whether or not indicators were achieved (yes-no). The other, a weighted tool that allowed for tracking achievement/partial achievement and collecting baseline data. The consensus was that the weighted tool would be easy to use and useful to grantee and federal project staff.

Cassandra will be refining the tool and will submit it for the team's review.



Workgroup Discussion

5

Please consider the following questions when reviewing outcomes 2 and 3:

- Do either or both outcomes reflect your program's goals?
- Are any of the indicators inappropriate or unreasonable?
- Are you tracking any of them currently?
- What challenges do you see in collecting uniform data on any of the indicators?
- What suggestions do you have for alternative indicators or outcomes, or for data collection?

Outcome 2: Grantees develop a sustainable state-wide system that increases involvement of organizations & individuals in promoting community-based respite services.

6

Potential Indicators:

- An increase in the number of stakeholders who actively promote, fund, provide, or otherwise support respite services.
- An annual increase in financial and/or in-kind contributions to the state's Lifespan Respite project.
- An increase of faith-based, community-based agencies, public agencies, or private clubs/organizations with a pool of respite providers available to assist local caregivers.
- By the final year of this grant, resources outside of the Lifespan Respite grant are secured for the continuation of a at least one key project activity for an additional 2 years.
- An increase in public and private organizations that include language related to respite in their policies and procedures manuals.
- An increase in funding distributed to caregivers for the purpose of accessing respite.

Outcome 3: *Lifespan Respite activities result in increased access to respite resources across the state.*

7

Possible Indicators

- An increase in the number of respite providers available in each county in the state.
- Annually, there is a decrease in caregivers unable to locate an appropriately trained provider.
- There is a decrease in the number of steps caregivers report having to take prior to accessing respite.

Our Next call

8

- Thursday February 15, 2018 3pm (ET)/ 2pm (CT)/ 1pm (MT)/ noon (PT) for 90 minutes
- Content: review and discussion draft data collection tool
- Identify grantees willing to test a revision of the data collection tool beginning in late Spring 2018
- Feel free to share tools and examples of data collection resources in between calls