

FINISHED FILE

ATLAS RESEARCH
SAMI COUTOURE/NELS R. BENSON
AUGUST 12, 2019

PDG B-5 DATA SERIES COMMUNITY OF CONVERSATION
PROGRAM PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
2:00 PM CT

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
800-825-5234
www.captionfirst.com

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

>> Hi, guys, this is Rich Gonzalez. (Audio feedback).

>> EVELYN KEATING: Hi, everyone. We'll get started in just a few minutes. Hi, everyone. Thank you for joining us. We've reached our start time. All participants have been muted. You can press star 6 to unmute and then star 6 again to remute yourself.

This meeting is being recorded, and the recording will go out after the meeting. Please check out the attachment pod for the slides from today's meeting and the guidance that was sent a couple of weeks ago. This presentation was made possible by the Preschool Development Grants birth through five initiative from the office of child care, administration for children and families, US department of health and human services, and the US Department of Education.

We're excited to welcome Ruth Seeley as our expert today to lead us through the performance community of conversation. Without further ado, I'll turn it over to you, Ruth.

>> RUTH SEELEY: Thank you, Evelyn. Welcome, everybody. I'm excited to be talking to you today about the PDG B- 5 initial performance evaluation guidance. Moving over to the agenda, we're going to provide a quick overview of the elements of the initial guidance and then primarily -- (echoing) I'm getting some feedback. Then primarily I want to use this time for an open forum to get your thoughts on PPE and answer any questions that you may have.

So what I want to say -- this slide provides a little bit of my background. Before we get started, I do want to reiterate that the initial guidance document includes recommendations only based on promise and exams and evaluation across the performance activities. Grantees are encouraged to tailor how they use this guidance for their PPE plan according to what is reasonable and feasible for their programs because plan considerations will vary by grantee depending on what's applicable or appropriate for each grantee.

So PDG B- 5 initial grantees are required to develop performance program evaluation plans that detail how they will R they will monitor progress according to their goals and objectives and use that resulting information to inform and process and for improvement.

PPE is the ongoing self-examination of mixed delivery system or MDS accomplishments particularly toward established goals found in the strategic plan.

PPE allows grantees to self-assess how they're carrying out the PDG B- 5 grant and should result in an analysis that grantees can use to improve PDG B- 5 grant implementation and results continuously.

Grantees can use PPE to self-assess and monitor ongoing progress, identify opportunities for continuous quality improvement, and share lessons learned. They can use it to glean insights into the characteristics of their individual MDS as well as inputs and outputs of PDG B- 5 strategic plan activity. It's important to note here that grantees may rely on existing data that has already collected, and they also may determine that they need

new data metrics or data elements to examine their PPE. PPE plans and the data used to examine questions will likely evolve over the life cycle of the grant to address the strategic plan activities.

So strategic planning and PPE go hand in hand. And the figure on this slide provides an overview of where PPE planning may fall within the timing of other PDG B- 5 activities.

As you'll see on the slide, the needs assessment does feed into the strategic plan. And while strategic plans are certainly broader than the needs assessments, those findings do feed into the rest of the planning process including logic model design and the PPE plan.

So going into the PPE planning process, grantees who did not finalize the logic model with their strategic plan can create one before creating their PPE plan or refine an existing logic model to make sure that the PPE plan fairly connects to the goals, objectives, activities, and intended outputs and outcomes of their strategic plan.

It is important to note that strategic plans, logic models, and PPE plans may change throughout the duration of the grant cycle based on how grantees' MDS and grant programs mature and evolve. To that end PPE findings and PDG B- 5 needs assessment results should feedback into strategic plans for continuous refinement.

So the figure on this slide shows how parts of the PDG B- 5 planning activities ultimately lead to parts of the PPE plan. Grantees should align their PPE plans with the most recent version of their PDG B- 5 strategic plan, and those strategic plans should identify specific measurable objective, action plans, and indicators based on gaps identified in the PDG B- 5 needs assessment.

We've already talked about logic models may help articulate the parameters and expectations of their specific PDG B- 5 grant activities and can perform precise communications about leveraging PPE to inform continuous quality improvement. B- 5 grant activities ensure that PPE plans are cohesive and contribute to grantees' overall visions, goals and objectives.

So the first funding opportunity announcement lists just the components for grantees' consideration as element to include in their PPE plan. These suggestions included, among other things, taking into account the metrics necessary to examine process cost and implementation reporting and identifying an appropriate methodological approach including metrics of progress to inform continuous learning and improvement efforts.

The following slide gets to the meat of why we're here today and breaks down the outline for creating a PPE plan that outlines the department's suggestions for a comprehensive PPE plan.

These are recommendations based on federal program and performance evaluation best practices. We recognize plan considerations will vary by grantee depending on whether considerations are applicable or appropriate.

Grantees are encouraged to use the outline pieces that will work for their program.

So here on the slide provides the outline of the PPE plan as it was provided in the initial guidance document. I'll go through each section at a high level now. Then we'll have our open forum to have a broader conversation. And I look forward to any and all questions that have already arisen.

So the introduction to the PPE plan should explain the purpose of the plan. For example, an introduction might include that the PPE plan details the methods and strategies the grantee will use to monitor progress, for their goals and objectives, and use the resulting information to inform continuous quality improvement.

It might also describe the aims and questions that grantees intend to answer via their PPE.

In the overview the grantee should explain what they hope to achieve via other PPE and the processes they will use to conduct it. The overview should include an overarching statement of the insights or lessons the grantee wants to gain as well as any milestones for PPE implementation. This is the section where grantees can describe the inputs, key processes, and expected outcomes of their funded activities as they will be examined via the program performance evaluation.

The timeline indicated in the PPE plan should account for the full and continuous life cycle of PPE planning and implementation. This includes planning PPE staff recruitment and training and data collection analysis and reporting. It should also account for any protocols or processes that you might need to collect existing administrative data as well as any new data if that's applicable. So, for example, if data use agreements or institutional review board approvals are going to be required for grantees' individualized PPE, it should be accounted for in the timeline.

Timelines and the actions within them, as prescribed by the PPE plan, will be unique to each grantee and will depend on what each will need to conduct an organized and valuable performance evaluation that will provide the analysis needed to identify those opportunities against the continuous quality improvement.

The PPE resources section refers to the key personnel and partners of responsible for implementing PPE as well as the budget that's dedicated to it. So grantees should include named personnel who will have a role in implementing PPE as well as each individual's responsibilities in this section. That could be done via a table format with a column each for the name of the individual, their role, and their responsibilities as they pertain to PPE.

This will also include -- so this will include those responsible for directing PPE implementation, those responsible for collecting and analyzing data, those responsible for creating a report or summary of those findings and those responsible for sharing those PPE findings.

Grantees may want to consider having PPE partners, which would be external entities who would support PPE. So what would that look like? Partners, such as those identified as collaborators in the strategic plan as well as others may have data they can provide to

support PPE and or have personnel that they can lend to support analysis in reporting.

The final part of the PPE resources is the budget. That should include things like labor hours, data analysis, software costs, and any in kind or partner resources who contribute to PPE activities. The budget needs to provide enough detail to adequately justify costs associated with PPE, but what that level of detail looks like is up to the grantee.

Grantees should identify and prioritize their goals and objectives in the next section in alignment with their vision statement. They should also use this section to determine the PPE questions that they intend to answer and to determine the indicators that they intend to use to demonstrate progress in the PPE design selection.

They can include in this section their hypotheses for our indicators will demonstrate or answer PPE questions which will help focus PPE examination. The data sources section It should show data elements or sources grantees plan to use in their PPE along with any linkages they have.

It should also describe any new data collection planned such as the type of the new data the grantee plans to collect, where that data will come from, and how it will be collected.

This section should also account for any protocols or processes that are needed to collect existing administrative data or new data where applicable.

Grantees should describe their planned approach for analyzing existing and new data in the data analysis section. So this would include any specific statistical method, i.e.: models, formulas or techniques that grantees plan to use in their analysis. Grantees can also use this section to describe any data analysis software they plan to use. And here they can also explain the need for any data analysis software.

The data privacy and security section is for grantees should document whether personal identifiable information will be collected and if so, one, who will have access to it, and two, how it will be secured against unauthorized access. In this section they should also include considerations for their protocol if they receive PII unintentionally and how they would handle such also.

For the using and reporting PPE findings, grantees should describe how they will share trends and opportunities for continuous quality improvement or corrective actions in this section. That would include what kind of reporting they will provide, i.e.: informal as well as the frequency and who would receive the reporting. They should include how they will share lessons learned with other PDG B- 5 grantees.

Finally, a grantee should document their assumptions for being able to implement their PPE plan and any obstacles or constraints they anticipate and how they would mitigate those in the assumptions, restraints and risks section. Some of the considerations here may include data capacity limitations, the

availability of existing administrative data, the availability of new data that the grantee would like to collect, PPE partner support, and any other assumptions, constraint, or risks. With that, that gets us through our high-level overview. And we will open it up now to Q&A and a discussion.

>> EVELYN KEATING: Hi, Ruth, there are two questions. One from Jim, and one from Wende in the chat box. Either for you or Richard.

>> All right. This is Richard. I'll take Jim's question. The question reads for those states who already receive PDG B- 5 awards, that's everybody on the call hopefully, and are currently working through activities 1 through 5, does a new PPE need to be created? For example, if a PPE was included in the initial proposal, does it need to be redone and submitted?

So the answer is probably conditional on each state's situation. So if it was submitted with your original award, it still needs to be submitted again because we're going to be looking at it in light of the work being done. So at the time that you wrote the PPE, if you wrote it at the time of your application, clearly things could be changing over the course of the year. And so at the very least, we would recommend that you look at it, see what additional edits might need to be made, and you would then be able to submit it for acceptance by the department. In the actual funding announcement, there was a statement that said, once chosen, grantees will have the opportunity to revise and finalize their program performance evaluation plan with the support of designated TA provider which is what this call is about and what your TA specialist is there to assist you with.

The idea is that this could be evaluated or revised any time during the course of the performance of the first year of funding. So the idea here is that if you look at your PPE, if you feel it addresses everything it needs to address and it doesn't need to be -- and it doesn't require any changes, you can resubmit it. You'll get some directions for when to do so. And we will look at it as we're doing with the needs assessment and strategic plan. Then we will give you feedback if we think there are core elements that are missing.

But to the one question, regardless of whether it was submitted as part of your grant proposal, it would need to be submitted again.

>> RUTH SEELEY: Thank you. We also have a question from Wende Baker will a finalized PPE for implementation be an expected deliverable for the first PDG B- 5 grant if appropriate, please provide any feedback about whether the PPE will be included in a PDG renewal grant FOA?

What I would say to the first part of the question, the department's expect all current grantees to develop and create a PPE plan during this planning year. There isn't a formal deadline for that other than prior to the end of the grant period. But we do

encourage you to develop as much as possible prior to the submission of the next application to better inform your submission. And I do not have any information about what might be included in a PDG renewal grant. I would say the department would communicate any future requirements for PPE planning and implementation when that FOA is released.

Do we have any other questions? I think Evelyn, I think you said it's star 6 to unmute. If there are any other questions, I am here and happy to answer them. Maybe as people are thinking about their questions, some things -- if anybody on the line has done a PPE type plan or implementation previously, we would love to hear what's worked well for you and how some of those lessons learned or promise and practices could be applied to the PDG B- 5 PPE. Kate is requesting when and to whom do we deliver the PPE whether it is proposed or revised, the PPE plan.

So I know that you are able to work with the technical assistance team to refine them and then I believe -- Richard, correct me if I'm wrong, those would be shared with the department for review and acceptance although the departments are not doing any type of formal approval.

>> RICHARD GONZALEZ: That is correct. Basically your communication is going to go as with your needs assessment and strategic planning, your communications will be with your federal project officer, our assigned project federal officer, and as was already mentioned, your TA specialist. If you know who your regional office point person is as part of the team, you would send it to them also, otherwise, we would do it also. The team of those three people will review what you submit against the guidance and against what's in the language in the funding announcement. Then we would give feedback if any is necessary.

>> RUTH SEELEY: So Steven Hicks is asking if we're satisfied with our PPE as described in our funded application. Is there any action that we need to take?

>> RICHARD GONZALEZ: Nope. You just submit it. You would submit it to your federal project officer and our TA specialist for consideration.

>> EVELYN KEATING: Feel free to take yourself off mute by pressing star 6 and ask your question if you don't want to put them in the chat box. We have a new question from Linda Warren.

>> RUTH SEELEY: Linda asks, what do you mean for consideration? We have been implementing this plan for six months.

>> RICHARD GONZALEZ: Okay. Thanks. Bad word. Basically you are implementing the plan. What I meant for consideration or acceptance is the term I used previously is we want to be able to give you feedback if we think that there are other -- if there are pieces missing that should be developed. The original intent of the PPE was to help guide your first year, but it was also with the idea that it would help frame and prepare you for the next application you submit, so that when you submit the application, basically what we envision the PPE plan to be, the program performance evaluation

to be, was this idea that you would be able to hit the ground running if you're funded in the next round. If you're not funded in the next round, you would have something that could be useful for any additional funding you received.

So some states -- states were not necessarily expected to implement in the first year unless they were ready to do so, and they could use the first year for development. So if you're already implementing the plan, if it was already developed and ready to go, then you're ahead of the game. And what we will be doing is giving feedback to you if we think there are elements of the plan that are missing or could be developed further. In the end we're not proving it. We're just giving you feedback to try to help you make the plan stronger if we think there are ways that you might consider doing.

Let me ask a question to the group while we're waiting for another question. And you could hit star 6 to come off to answer. I'm interested in -- for those people who have already developed the plan or started developing the plan or are challenged by the plan, I'm interested in knowing what are some of the more difficult pieces of developing the plan? Have you run into challenges for which you could use additional guidance or support or clarification? It would be helpful to know are you finding this task an easy task? If it's difficult, why is it difficult? What seems to be unclear or what seems to be the -- what seems to be getting -- what seems to be the road block that gets in the way of you being able to accomplish it, if there are those road blocks?

>> RUTH SEELEY: I know that we have a question from Heather rows and I apologize if I mispronounced if you want to give folks a couple minutes to react to Richard's question, I'll make sure we answer you.

>> RICHARD GONZALEZ: So to Heather's question, the idea here is if you have not yet developed a complete program performance evaluation plan, that you are to do so in the first year. And the idea is that the plan you're developing not only will address any steps that you might still need to take, but it would set the stage for what you believe will be what you need to do going forward.

So I know that is somewhat vague, but since the plan is intended to be a living document that gets modified over time, you're going to create something with the best thinking in mind of where you need to go now, where you need to be going, what you need to have in place as you proceed, what you need to have in place over the course of the next several months to the end of the first year. But then with the understanding that should you apply for the next round of funding, should you be awarded for the next round of funding, you again would be looking at that program performance evaluation to determine what, if anything, needs to be modified or tweaked based on what you were awarded to provide.

So it's kind of an anticipating where you need to be going but at the same time working on a plan that allows you to assess that which is taking place. It's kind of a present plan and a future plan. It's changing and shifting as you go along.

>> RUTH SEELEY: What I would -- everything that Richard said and some of the things that you can consider, even if you're not at implementation yet, is some of the metrics that you would like to strengthen or develop as the program develops and how those indicators would drive your MDS and your grant program forward.

>> RICHARD GONZALEZ: So, for example, if you have not yet finished your strategic plan, maybe you've not finished your needs assessment. You can still be developing a program performance evaluation that is based on what you're anticipating, based on what you're attempting to assess, based on what you think are going to be the outcomes, and then you're anticipating what is the data I'll have to collect, what are the steps I'll have to take? Who are the people I'll have to involve? All the elements listed in the prior slides. And then as you learn more from the needs assessment, as you learn more, as you sit down to do the strategic plan, you would obviously be tweaking and possibly changing content based on what you're learning.

>> RUTH SEELEY: And so NYS team asks, do we have to develop a plan for evaluation based upon the current year, but if we get funding for the next three years, we will have to change that plan? Or do we identify indicators based on our strategic plan?

I think that's a great question. Go ahead, Richard.

>> RICHARD GONZALEZ: I was going to say, there are two things in mind. People have asked this earlier. What are we doing for the first year versus what are we doing for the next competition? So there's a problem here. One is that we cannot tell you what's going to be in the next funding announcement, because it's still in development and review. So anything we say might be wrong or would be premature to share. So everything we're doing today is to kind of inform the initial grant that you have now.

But the initial grant and the initial funding announcement established this tool as a tool that is going to guide your future funding. So to answer that question, you are basically developing a plan based on the current year. So yes, you are identifying indicators based on your strategic plan because what else can you base it on right now? If your strategic plan is telling you where to go, then this is what you're going to be doing.

If you've sat down now as groups, and we certainly encourage you to be talking already, don't wait for the funding announcement to start thinking about what you're going to put in the next application. Start talking, thinking, and planning. If you're doing that, then from that discussion may come suggestions of other indicators, of course. We would assume it's still going to be part of your strategic planning because your strategic plan is driving your future work. But I guess I don't want people to limit themselves. Don't put yourself in a box. Don't think this all has to be been the strategic plan or this all has to be within the first year. It's kind of as you're thinking about what you're going to be evaluating, what do you want to know the answers to? What do you want to be able to address performance about? Whatever those issues

are, that's why it becomes an individual state situation. You're trying to answer questions that are going to be important for you. You're trying to determine what is important for you to evaluate over time, and can that change? Yes, it can. But for now you only have the work you're doing in this initial year to kind of guide you.

So if you have a strategic plan already developed, that certainly is going to be the indicators that are coming to play. If you haven't developed that yet, then you probably are thinking about the indicators that may become factors, although those may change as information becomes more definite.

>> RUTH SEELEY: Yep.

(Overlapping Speakers)

>> RICHARD GONZALEZ: Go ahead. I'm sorry.

>> Evelyn KEATING: That's okay, Richard. Go ahead.

>> RICHARD GONZALEZ: The state of California says it's due at the end of the first year however the application for the second round would be due prior to this. It seems to be a disservice to the application if you don't already have the PPE completed.

That is why -- that is not a bad statement. That is why we put into the first funding announcement the idea that you should develop a PPE to set the stages for your future work. If you don't have a PPE -- although the technical requirement is that you must have a PPE developed by the end of the first year. Does it make sense to have one in place so that it can inform your next competition? Sure. But are you required to have it for your next competition? No.

So that's where the disparity is or that's where the unevenness is. Some people -- I forgot who it was already. Someone said mine was already done. It was submitted with my application the first time. Well, that's great. Some of you are in the process of developing it. The difference here is only do you have to have it by the application time? No. That wasn't a requirement in the first grant. And all we can hold you to is what's required in the first grant. Does it make sense to try to work on this now and have it completed by the time you submit your application? That seems like a reasonable suggestion, but it's not a requirement.

>> RUTH SEELEY: Richard, I think this is a question for you. Kate Gallagher is asking are you using the term implementation to refer to the strategic plan or to the implementation of the PDG grant? We have been implementing our PPE for our PDG grant but not for the strategic plan goals as our strategic plan is not in place. Are you referring to the strategic plan as the tool?

>> RICHARD GONZALEZ: No, I'm not. Again, this gets muddy, right. For those of you who developed a program performance evaluation plan either prior to the application you submitted or after the application you submitted, after you were awarded, you were actually using that plan to implement your grant, to evaluate -- to evaluate your grant and the work that you're doing in that grant.

Once you develop a strategic plan, and that could have been already or it could be one that's still in development, once you

develop the strategic plan, there is an assumption on our part, which I don't think is incorrect, that the strategic plan will begin driving the work that you will be doing going forward so that if you have a strategic plan already in place, then it's hard to separate out what the goals -- in my mind, it's hard to separate out what the goals of the PDG grant are from the strategic plan. Because I think they're going to start to cross over.

However, there are going to be -- because -- again, depending on where you are in your state's work, if you're still working on a needs assessment, then you're going to end up revising or updating your strategic plan based on what you learn from that needs assessment. So the strategic -- none of these things stay static. The strategic plan that exists from day one of your award is not necessarily look the same as the strategic plan that you have six months into the year or at the time of the next application.

So my answer to you is that if you develop the PPE plan, then you're using it to implement the PDG grant. And that may or may not also be helping you to carry out the goals of your strategic plan. I hope that's clear -- clear as mud probably. Okay.

So Richard's question, intention is to have -- this is Wende Baker, our intention is to have available preliminary information that will allow definition of elements in the administrative data requirement, but the full scope is challenging. The timing of development work is for data systems is in determining the priorities and initial system investments as some of the work is a Category 5 activity for us. And at we will now be beginning that work, it will be more limited in informing the PPE before the end of the grant award period.

Okay. So let's talk about that a moment. Again, the realities of your state and your work is that you're going to be developing a PPE plan. It sounds here like there will be work either takes place simultaneous to the next application being developed or maybe even after the next application is developed, which means that anything you develop now is part of your program performance evaluation plan would be then tweaked, would then be updated, modified to reflect any new learning that take place.

So you can only do -- like you suggested here. You can only do what you can do with what's available to you in the moment. So you're going to do the best you can by identifying a definition of the elements of your administrative data. You're going to maybe guess some data elements that might be useful. And then as you move forward to carry out the work and activity in Category 5, you are going to find maybe other information that either will confirm or contradict what you thought was going to be originally the data elements you were going to collect. At that point in time you would make a modification to your PPE plan that would carry you through the future time and grant if you're awarded or even if you're not awarded. I think the PPE plan is valuable to any state regardless of whether you get awarded or not because there's other work that you're doing within the state.

So I think that, again, to the issue -- that is absolutely a real challenge, and what I would ask you is I don't know -- Wende Baker, I don't know what state you're with. But I would ask you if you're not already talking to your federal project officer about the category five activities and you can access some of that funding, you probably want to do so, and they may be able to assist you in thinking about -- if there is anything that can be done to move that up more quickly.

So why don't we give it one more -- we'll give it another couple of minutes to see if there are any last questions. We don't need to keep people on for no reason. If there are no other questions, we can give you back 15 minutes of your time which I'm sure, like me, we could always use an extra 15 minutes. So let's see -- we'll give it another minute or two to see if there are any last questions. And then I'll turn it back over to the presenters who may talk to you about next steps or how we see this proceeding.

So the question from Erin, I know logic models are recommended and can prove quite helpful. Are they required?

Interesting question. I would say they're required because they're part of what was supposed to be in the original application. Now whether you submitted it or not and whether you got points off for what you submitted, I don't know. But logic models are the pieces that will help drive the work that you're doing. So they are recommended. I cannot tell you whether they will be -- if they will pop up again in the next funding announcement. I don't know yet whether it will be a required element in the next funding announcement. But related to this work, we believe it helps guide the work and helps answer questions that you have from the beginning. Anybody else on the team want to answer that differently, please add to it what I've just said.

>> RUTH SEELEY: I agree with everything you said, Richard. I would add they help with the parameters and expectation of your specific grant activities. So they can help inform exactly how to leverage your PPE, as we've talked about, as a continuous process, to leverage PPE so it's feeding back into your strategic plan as part of that continuous quality improvement process.

>> RICHARD GONZALEZ: If the question is, do you have to submit your logic model with the PPE plan that you submit - is it required? (Laughing) great question. We'll take it under advisement with each state. We'll look at why you didn't submit it, and we'll consider why you didn't submit it. Why don't you think you need it? If you want to make a case for why it's not necessary, we would consider that.

Okay. Ruth or anyone else, I don't know if you have any closing questions or comments that you want to ask. That appears to be the end of the questions from the participants.

>> RUTH SEELEY: Great. Thank you, everybody. And if you have additional questions that arise after this session, please feel free to reach out to the technical assistance center. We are here to answer, and they are there to help you as you go through the process

of refining your PPE plan.

One thing I want to reiterate that this is going to be a living document that will evolve as your programs evolve and as lessons are learned, and as you shift towards further progress against your goals and objectives. So hopefully it becomes an incredibly useful tool as you continue your planning and implementation for at least this initial grant and anything that happens beyond.

In terms of next steps, we are going to be issuing a secondary guidance that will provide a little bit more information and considerations for your PPE plan so that you are able to submit a cohesive, well thought through plan that will provide meaningful PPE in the implementation phase. If you're not there yet and if you are already there, maybe to spark something that you haven't already thought of. So you can look for that guidance to be coming out in the next few weeks or so.

Our hope is to get it out -- we will get it out to you as quickly as possible. So if there are specific questions that you have that you would like to get answers, we are open to that feedback as well.

>> RICHARD GONZALEZ: Another thing I wanted to say in closing that you just reminded me of in your statement. Folks, this document -- you're not creating it for us. You're not creating it for the department. You're creating it for you. It's supposed to be a tool that's useful to you. So what you give us -- first of all, that's why we're not approving it. We have no idea what you're doing in your state to a degree that we would be able to approve such a plan. What we're trying to do is give you guidance and feedback to develop a plan that will be meaningful to you. To the extent -- that's the same thing, the approach that we've taken with the needs assessment and strategic plan. You're not doing it for the department. You're doing it for you. If you're not doing it for you, if you're not creating these things to be helpful to you, you've missed the intent of the funding. And I want to reiterate that because ultimately when you ask questions like is this required, is this needed, I understand you're trying to meet the conditions of the grant, but please also make sure that what you're doing is going to make a difference to you and the stakeholders in your state. Because if it's not, why include it? Why put it in? Don't do it.

It's supposed to help you make a difference and move the field, move the needle along, make improvements in the kind of data you're collecting, the kind of evaluation you're doing, and ultimately the services and outcomes that you're achieving. So maybe that can be our closing comment because ultimately I really don't want people to feel that you're doing this for us. You're doing it for you.

Thank you, everybody.

>> RUTH SEELEY: Thank you for your time, everybody.

>> EVELYN KEATING: Thank you, Ruth and Richard, and the recording of this will go out along with the attachments in the next couple of days. Have a great afternoon, everyone.

(Webinar concluded at 2:50 PM CT)

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
800-825-5234
www.captionfirst.com

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.
