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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Component 3: Evaluation & Assessment | *Develop and revise assessment tools for measuring the extent to which community organizations incorporate a TI-HR perspective, and the degree of students’ TI-HR related knowledge, self-efficacy, attitudes, practice behaviors and behavioral intentions* |

### 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proposed objectives and outcomes:** | **Measurable outcomes and resulting products** |
| Conduct measure development consultations with key informants  | Consultations with Roger Fallot and Linda Frisman regarding utility of measures and refining the surveys took place in 2009 - 2010 |
| Develop Organizational evaluation tool | Developed Fall 2009 as an online survey of agency knowledge, training and implementation of TI‐HR principles, including organizational characteristics, personnel training and skills, and employee rights.Reviewed existing literature (see Yoe et al., 2008; Fallot & Harris, 2006; Fallot & Harris, 2009)MSW Students assigned to formulate possible items* Used data gathered from focus groups and key informant meetings in component 1 to shape survey questions
* Designed to take more of a job satisfaction approach to provide a better understanding of whether the organization was treating staff in a trauma-informed manner
* 54 items included: 9 Safety items; 6 Trustworthiness; 7 Choice; 6 Collaboration; 8 Empowerment; 4 items on gender responsiveness; 1 human rights item; 4 items on how the agency handles human rights violations
 |
| Administer Organizational survey | Administered Spring 2010 (282 individuals from at least 51 agencies)* Obtained approval from the Institutional Review Board for a web-based survey
* Survey placed on Survey Monkey in Spring 2010
* Pilot tested and revised
* Emailed 617 organizations in WNY introducing survey and asking them to forward the link to staff
	+ Individuals from at least 51 agencies completed the survey
 |
| Analyze results of Organizational survey and revise based on findings | Though 282 surveys were downloaded from SurveyMonkey, response rates varied from 80-99%, indicating the need for further evaluation of the measure; large discrepancies in response rates may indicate how TIC components are being viewed* 65% of those who reported position indicated that they had direct client contact; 26% were in administrative positions and 8.4% were support staff
* Types of agencies that responded represented a wide range of service provision and were categorized (for analyses) into groups according to types of service provided)
* Item analysis was made based on participant’s responses across different categories of the survey instrument
* Factor analysis of the survey instrument to confirm structure is needed, but there were too few participants to allow for meaningful analytic results
	+ Initial subscales were retained
	+ Evaluated whether subscales were one-dimensional
* Ratings ranged from 1-5 (1 = agency has low concern for TI-HR, 5 = very high concern for TI-HR approach)
 |
| * Results assessing the utility of the tools
 | **Major Findings:*** Potential Identification of sub-dimensions within the 5 primary factors of the Trauma-Informed model suggesting strong need for factor analytic assessment of current survey
* Uncertain whether what was measured actually coincides with the 5 dimensions of TIC (Fallot and Harris, 2006; Bloom 1997)
	+ More work is needed to increase construct validity
	+ Results revealed the need to look at overall construct of TIC, how it is viewed and implemented at agency level as it is clear that respondents may view the TIC approach differently than how the measure was constructed
* Item Response rates varied significantly suggesting differential responding, though unsure what the implications of this are
	+ May need to use focus groups with organizations to address this, as it is important to gain an understanding of why respondents were willing to answer some questions but not others
	+ Most subscales showed high reliability though lowest for physical Safety and desire for training, suggesting need to consider how specific questions relate to the overall component
* Differences in correlations between subscales suggest the need to better understand the TIC construct and how staff view TIC
	+ Physical safety and desire for more training showed the weakest correlations with other subscales
	+ All between .4 or above with many at .7 and above (See table 3-7)
	+ Moderate correlations between HR and TIC with strongest relationships between TIC and GR, much weaker between GR and HR (See table 3-8)
* Comparing mean scores for subscales and sub-dimensions showed that physical and emotional safety were significantly higher than other sub-dimensions while collaboration tended to be significantly lower
	+ Significant differences between 11 of the 21 mean comparisons (See Figure 3-1)
* There were significant differences in perception of TIC based on education, position in the agency and as a function of organization type
	+ Education (See figures 3-2 and 3-3)
	+ Agency Position (See figures 3-4, 3-5 and Tables 3-9, 3-10
	+ Organization type (See tables 3-11, 3-12, 3-13 and figures 3-6, 3-7, 3-8, 3-9)
* Correlations between the TIC subscales and sub-dimensions of human rights and (gender responsiveness) were weaker than those within the TIC items, suggesting possible uncertainty regarding how human rights (and gender responsiveness) fit in the thinking of TIC
	+ May suggest a stronger need to identify how human rights fit within the organization and how they may be integrated with TIC approaches
	+ It was determined that these items would be dropped for ongoing use with as an assessment tool for ITTIC trainings
 |
| * Analyze quantitative results to assess attitudes, knowledge and use of Trauma-informed care
 | * **Safety (Emotional and Physical)**
	+ 76.9% completed all 9 subscale items. Alpha coefficient was .766 with mean inter-item correlations ranging from .018 to .856, suggesting possibility of multiple dimensions
		- Exploratory factor analysis showed this scale to be two-dimensional (emotional and physical/structural safety)
	+ Mean score for emotional safety dimension was 4.06 out of 5
		- Mean item scores all at or near 4, suggesting agencies showed somewhat high concern for emotional safety
		- 70% of respondents indicated a high or very high TI-HR concern
	+ Mean score for physical safety dimension was 4.03 out of 5
		- Mean scores reflected high TI-HR concern across agencies
		- Low scores on one item suggest lack of consideration for how colors and furniture reflect staff satisfaction
	+ (See table 3-1)
* T**rustworthiness**
	+ 216 respondents completed all of the trust items
	+ Factor Analysis confirmed trustworthiness subscale represented one basic dimension
	+ Mean trustworthiness score = 3.78 (out of 5)
		- Mean item scores varied from 3.52 – 4.21 indicating high levels of agency concern
		- Variability may suggest potential benefit in considering how items focused on fairness and those focused on communication independently influence staff performance
		- (See table 3-2)
* **Choice**
	+ 213 respondents completed all of the choice items
		- Reliability assessments showed an alpha of .849 with inter-item correlation ranging from .271 to .801
		- Factor analysis confirmed the item was one-dimensional
	+ Mean item score was 3.75, with range from 1.29 to 5

(See table 3-4)* **Empowerment (Support and training)**
	+ 225 respondents completed all of the empowerment subscale items
		- Alpha coefficient of .830, inter-item correlations ranged from .008 to 6.06, indicating a potential multi-dimensional subscale
		- Exploratory factor analysis confirms two factors within the empowerment subscale: agency support for staff trying and learning new things, and staff desire for more training and workshop opportunities
	+ Mean item score was 3.88 with range from 1.38 to 5 indicating mostly moderate to high TI-HR concern
		- Mean scores for support items was 3.98, suggesting for the most part, respondents felt they had support to try new things
		- Mean score for the desire for more training subscale was 3.73; these items were scored lowest suggesting an overall desire for more training
		- (See table 3-5)
* **Collaboration**
	+ Only 166 respondents completed all of the collaboration subscale items
		- Moderate internal consistency (alpha .789) with inter-item correlation ranging from 1.74 to 5.83
		- Factor analysis confirmed the Collaboration subscale is one-dimensional
	+ Mean item score was 3.61 with a range of 1.17 to 5, indicating moderate to high TI-HR concern from collaboration between staff
		- (See table 3-6)
* **Gender Responsiveness**
	+ A total of 188 (66.7) individuals responded to all four gender responsiveness items
		- Alpha coefficient was .638 with inter-item correlations ranging from .131 to .490
		- Factor analysis confirmed this is a one-dimensional scale
	+ Overall mean item score was 3.59
		- Nearly 34% of respondents indicate that gender does not play a role in the design of services at their agencies
		- Over a quarter indicate training on the influence of gender on recovery is lacking
* **Human Rights**
	+ 20.3% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that no one had told them about their rights as a staff member, 6.6% were unsure and 71.1% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, indicating that the majority of staff members felt their rights had been explained.
	+ Only 9% (out of 231) said their agency did not provide information about their rights in the agency
	+ 94% (of 229) said that steps could be taken to protect staff rights, including union action, filing a complaint, employee satisfaction surveys, speaking with supervisors, and others
	+ 225 responded with strategies to ensure clients rights are not violated, including satisfaction surveys, meetings with clients, reviewing incident reports, speaking with supervisors and a complaint box
 |
| Develop client survey* Administer client survey
 | Companion to the organization assessment; included items assessing safety, trustworthiness, choice, collaboration, empowerment, and two items referring to overall experience, 5 items on gender responsiveness and demographic questions* Administered in Spring 2010
	+ initially given to clients who participated in face-to-face interviews from component 1; some agencies agreed to leave surveys in waiting room for clients to drop in a lock box
	+ 31 clients from 4 agencies completed
	+ Received IRB approval in Late Spring 2010
 |
| Analyze results of the Client Surveys and make changes as necessary | Results were analyzed and reported in the final report along with suggestions for improvement |
| * Results assessing utility of the client assessment tool
 | * Factor Analysis was not pursued for the full scale or sub-dimensions due to small sample size
* The magnitudes of the correlations suggest constructs are strongly interrelated (See table 3-21)
* Differential responding in terms of person characteristics
	+ Males consistently report lower scores than females
	+ Non-white respondents report higher scores than white respondents
	+ Differences in terms of agency type (see table 3-22)
* Safety
	+ Alpha coefficient was .65 with inter-item correlations ranging from .08 to .617
* Trustworthiness
	+ Alpha coefficient was .722 with inter-item correlations ranging from .041 to .693
* Choice
	+ Alpha coefficient was .826 with inter-item correlations ranging from .149 to .764
* Collaboration
	+ Alpha coefficient was .502 with inter-item correlations ranging from -.082 to .828
* Empowerment
	+ Alpha coefficient was .636
* Satisfaction
	+ Means for the satisfaction items were consistent with the TIC subscales
	+ (See table 3-19)
* Gender Responsiveness
	+ Inter-item correlations varied from .051 to .536, supporting the assumption that gender responsiveness is heterogeneous
 |
| * Analyze results to assess clients' attitudes, knowledge and use of Trauma-informed care
 | * Safety: Mean scores of most of the 5 items were above 4 (out of 5), suggesting clients felt the agencies showed high levels of concern for their overall safety
	+ See table 3-14
* Trustworthiness: Mean scores for all five items were above 4, suggesting clients felt the organizations were effective at establishing trust
	+ See table 3-15
* Choice: Mean scores for all items except item 4 were above 4 indicating high likelihood that the organization approached the matter of clients’ choice in a trauma-informed manner
	+ See table 3-16
* Collaboration: The overall mean score was 3.99 with mean scores for items 1 and 2 that were significantly lower than some of the other items, suggesting collaboration may not have been given as much importance at the agency
	+ See table 3-17
* Empowerment: Overall mean score was 4.20 most item means above 4 indicating that agencies were likely using methods of client empowerment
	+ See table 3-18
* Satisfaction
	+ Two satisfaction items with means above 4, suggesting clients were generally satisfied with their experiences
* Gender Responsiveness: Mean items scores all cluster around 4, suggesting respondents felt the programs were responsive to different gender concerns
	+ See table 3-20
* Human Rights
	+ 75% or clients felt someone in the agency had informed them of their rights; 85% felts their service provider had informed them of their rights
	+ 87% felt there was a check system in place to protect their rights
 |
| Develop student evaluation tool | The student survey was originally developed in Fall 2009 with two aims: to assess student TI-HR knowledge, attitudes, self-efficacy, behavioral intentions and practice behavior; to identify whether the instrument is a reliable tool for evaluating student outcomes* MSW students assisted in formulating scales for the instrument development
 |
| Administer student survey | Administered in spring/summer 2010, then revised and administered again in fall 2010 (n=320) |
| Analyze results of the student survey | Results were analyzed to assess instrument utility as well as student knowledge, behavior and attitudes* Initially analyzed results from advanced standing students before and after completing their first summer semester.
* The next set of analyses include comparing differences between advanced year and foundation year students tested at the start of the Fall 2010 semester
* High correct response rates for the initial assessment of the advanced standing and foundation year students suggest that the items are not useful for assessing knowledge gain.
* Results showed significant changes for foundation year students, although advanced year students scored high at baseline
 |
| * Results of student TI-HR knowledge, attitudes, self-efficacy, behavioral intentions and practice behaviors and reliability of tool to evaluate outcomes
 | Knowledge* Scale construction analysis found knowledge items were heterogeneous and may reflect multiple constructs, though results from the factor analysis were inconclusive
	+ **Summer 2010 pre- and post-test results:** Correct response rates were reported for over 90% of the TIC items and may be associated with generally “Good social work practice”
		- Mean TIC knowledge scores showed little disparity between pre- and post-test results
		- Individually, some students showed positive movement while others regressed towards lower scores on the post-test
	+ Responses for the knowledge items for human rights were more varied than responses on the TIC items. Only two of the nine items had 90% or better correct response rates
		- Mean scores for human rights knowledge items decreased between pre and post test
		- The number of students scoring at the high end declined between the pre-test and post-test, suggesting that students may be more confused about human rights at the end
	+ **Fall 2010 analyses:** Overall the percent of correct responses was above 90% for 11 of the 16 items with a mean of almost 15, only one item was significantly different between foundation and advanced year students
		- Results for the human rights items raise questions about how the concepts are being taught
		- Some HR items showed lower correct responses among advanced year student compared to foundation year students
		- Reinforcing findings from summer, suggesting the need to assess how knowledge for TIC is considered an
* Attitudes
	+ The attitudes subscale had high internal consistency (alpha coefficient of .918) and responses to attitude items showed little variability
	+ **Summer 2010 analysis:** Students tended to give high positive responses, agreeing or strongly agreeing
	+ One item, focusing on avoidance of disappointing clients, showed poor relationships with the other items and the lowest student agreement rates
		- when this item was removed from the reliability assessment, factor analysis showed unitary factor structure
	+ **Fall 2010 analysis of first-year and second-year students** suggest that exposure to curriculum and field increased the positive feelings towards a TI-HR approach among students
		- Four of the twelve TIC items were statistically different between foundation and advanced year students
		- High percentage of students endorsed strongly agree in both groups, though higher likelihood among advanced year students suggesting 2nd year students had somewhat more positive attitudes towards TIC than foundation students
		- The human rights item did not differ in student attitudes between first and second year students
		- Need to consider how human rights are being presented in class and revise questions to match
* Self-Efficacy/Perceived Competence
	+ Good internal consistency was found in the self-efficacy subscale with an alpha of .857
	+ Exploratory factor analysis revealed of two meaningful factors within the 10 TIC items suggests that the feelings of competence may be very specific:
		- Confidence in ability to do actual work with and for clients (subscale alpha coefficient was .867)
		- Confidence in ability to be clear in communications with clients (subscale alpha coefficient was .798)
	+ **Summer 2010:** Overall, students felt more confidence in their abilities to deliver trauma-informed and human rights approaches to care at the post test as compared to the pre-test
		- Six of the 7 “confidence working with clients” subscale items increased at the post-semester assessment, with three reaching statistical significance
		- No statistically significant changes in the second subscale scores, “confidence in communicating clearly with clients”, as many students rated these items very high at the pre-test
		- Overall mean HR score increased significantly, suggesting that students gained feelings of confidence in how to identify and deal with violations of clients’ human rights.
		- Some students showed an overall decrease in confidence over the course of the semester, though most showed an overall increase in self-efficacy
	+ **Fall 2010 analyses:** Several of the self-efficacy items were significantly different between the two groups. Advanced year students reported greater confidence on some items, while on other items, foundation year students reported higher levels of confidence
		- Five of the seven self-efficacy in working with clients items were scored higher by 2nd year students compared to foundation year students with 2 reaching statistical significance
		- Two items were rated lower by 2nd year students compared with first year students, perhaps indicating a more realistic and pragmatic expectation of their own abilities after completing field and coursework
		- All 3 items in the confidence to communicate clearly with clients factor were significant with advanced year students reporting greater confidence than foundation students
		- The first human rights item reflected greater perceived competence among 2nd year students while the second reflected higher perceived competence among 1st year students.
* Behavioral Intentions
	+ Scoring format was altered for the summer advanced standing sample, so results were not reported
	+ Fall 2010 analyses: 2nd year students showed a greater likelihood of endorsing behaviors that are more trauma-informed, while foundation year students were more likely to endorse items that were less trauma-informed
 |
| Revise surveys based on findings | Organizational Survey:Suggestions for revisions and modifications were made in the final report* It was proposed that the revised instruments will be administered to other selected agencies and the process will be repeated in order to better understand the strengths and limitations of the instruments within field settings, and the implications of the information for training recommendations.
	+ A factor analysis is needed to confirm the structure, but there were too few participants to allow for meaningful factor analytic results
* It was suggested that future work should include more males and minorities to see whether demographic characteristics are associated with different perceptions of TIC and HR components
* Modifications since 2010: dropped 8 safety items, human rights items and gender-related items
* The modified survey is now used as one of the assessment tools for ITTIC, but data from these surveys in no longer used for the purpose of further evaluating and understanding the assessment tool

Client Survey:Recommended Revisions and future directions for the client survey were proposed in the final report.* Validity of the scale needs to be evaluated with more responses
* Further analyze the variation in TIC, satisfaction and gender responsiveness in order to better understand why responses varied and how the constructs are viewed

No additional changes or analyses have been made since the final report was completed. Though some agencies who participate in ITTIC trainings do ask to include client assessments, this data is not used to evaluate the assessment tool.Student Survey: Continued revision to the student survey in order to look for potential subscales and identify better methods for assessing the knowledge gains and attitudes towards TI-HR approaches were recommended* + Knowledge section results suggest a need for possible further refinement of the items to form more homogeneous subscales to gain internally consistent measures
	+ The possible link between knowledge or TI-HR concepts and good social work practice needs to be explored further to determine how it may interact with implementation of a TI-HR approach
	+ May need to consider a better approach for assessing knowledge gain due to high correct response rates (perhaps using a case example, similar to the behavioral intentions section where students can identify if a TI-HR approach was utilized)
	+ It was proposed that alternative methods of assessing attitude would be piloted to see if other methods offer a better assessment of whether changes in attitudes towards a TI-HR approach change after exposure to curriculum and field
* May be beneficial to modify survey in order to find ways of assessing the impact students are having on the organizational level through field, and how the organizations are impacting students’ knowledge, attitudes, behaviors and confidence around TI-HR approaches

Upon further reflection, it was determined that no further revisions would be made to the survey. However the survey is still available for use upon request. In 2013, another university has requested to use the student survey. |
| Develop University Culture and Climate survey* Administer Culture and Climate survey
* Analyze Findings
 | Purchased and modified Glisson’s culture and climate scale (Glisson, 2007; Hemmelgam, Glisson & Lawrence, 2006) for use in the School or Social Work* Administered through SurveyMonkey in 2011
	+ Results showed the university was not doing well with the transition and that a lot of work still needed to be done
	+ Results were presented and discussed at a faculty retreat
* It was determined that the Culture and Climate survey was not a good fit for confidentially evaluating faculty and staff attitudes and perceptions of the TI-HR so no further revisions were made.
 |
| Disseminate findings | See “Publications and Presentations” for dissemination of information from qualitative organizational, client and student surveys. The Organizational Survey has been modified since 2010 and is now used as one of the assessment tools for the Institute on Trauma and Trauma-Informed Care (ITTIC). The client survey is also utilized as part of ITTIC training upon request of the agency receiving the training. Specific adjustments are made to the client survey based on the clients and the agency. It was determined that no additional revisions would be made to the Student survey or the Culture and Climate survey. Surveys are available for use upon request by contacting: thn@buffalo.edu |
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