



Analysis of Parent/Guardian Training and Information Interventions for CaPROMISE youth

prepared by the CaPROMISE Research Team, Interwork Institute,
San Diego State University (July 30, 2018)

Preface

Guiding Principles for CaPROMISE Program Evaluation

Before enumerating the specific evaluation findings, here are guiding principles that the SDSU team uses in their approach to CaPROMISE Program Evaluation (PE):

1. Informs and guides Project activities and assesses outcomes. Every PE inquiry is initiated with the premise that the findings will provide useful guidance for efficiently implementing interventions, providing needed services and informing policies.
2. Insures all PE efforts are classified as either *formative* or *summative*. CaPROMISE *formative* evaluation findings document interventions, services, practices and staff approaches that are '*keeping the train on the tracks*' as well as practices and approaches that appear to be falling short of attaining the intended outcomes. CaPROMISE's *summative* evaluation findings determine the extent to which the goals were met after interventions and services.
3. Insures conformance in accordance with Institutional Review Board guidelines regarding access to youth and family evaluation data. The source of all data is based 100% on what is entered by the CSCs into the Data Management System (DMS). The good news is that this restriction of access preserves the confidentiality and the anonymity of the CaPROMISE youth and their family members. The caution regarding this restriction is that any incomplete and/or delayed data entry by the CSCs yields an underestimate of the volume and breadth of services and interventions as well as CaPROMISE goal attainment.
4. Recognizes the significant burden on CSCs to 'keep up' with the DMS data entries. The DMS was designed to be as 'user friendly' as it could be without sacrificing the 'richness in detail' of the entered data. CaPROMISE is about service delivery, not 'paperwork'. But this 'user friendly' aspect has a potential down side. For example, a checked box for 'Coaching' under the Core Service area of 'Parent/Guardian Training and Information' informs the Project that this specific intervention was provided. Certainly, this is a valuable piece of information that becomes a part of the family's data profile. While it is useful to have that depth and breadth of detail for each intervention, the reporting burden that it places upon the CSCs may be unreasonable. This is why the SDSU Interwork staff conduct a number of on-site interviews – to have conversations that furnish rich, qualitative details about the interventions implemented by the CSCs.

- Documents and disseminates CaPROMISE Evaluation findings to all stakeholders in a clearly presented format and in a timely manner. To facilitate easy digestion of the reports, the descriptions of specific statistical tools and the analysis procedures are not generally included in the reports. These details are available upon request for those readers who express an interest.

Introduction

The following information provides a summary of the PE activity conducted in May, 2018. The PE inquiry focused on Parent/Guardian Training and Information interventions through year 4 (October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017) and their association with several data elements.

The questions and findings related to this inquiry are described in the next section. As you review the results, *perhaps you might want to reflect on whether the findings were generally what you suspected.*

Findings for PE Analyses of Parent/Guardian Training & Information Interventions (Referral, Coaching and FRC Support)

- What were the number of Parent/Guardian Training and Information interventions logged into the DMS?

Findings: As shown in the following table, there were a total of 22,898 interventions recorded for this Core Service area. The total number for each of the three services as well as the average number of services per Parent/Guardian household are included in the following table.

	Total	Referral	Coaching	FRC support
Average	13.91	4.24	10.14	2.98
Total	22,898	6,974	16,686	4,901

- Were there gender differences associated with the number of Parent/Guardian Training and Information interventions?

Findings: No. The figures for all three services and Totals were comparable for male and female youth.

- Were there differences in the number of Parent/Guardian Training and Information interventions associated with age at enrollment?

Findings: No. The figures for all three services and Totals were comparable for 14, 15 and 16-year-old youth after enrollment.

4. Were there differences in the number of Parent/Guardian Training and Information interventions associated with 'disability' as defined by OSEP's 13 disability categories?

Findings: Yes. There were significant differences in the average number of interventions among the 13 groups for each of the services as well as the Total average for this Core Service area. The shaded areas in the table below indicate either extreme high or low average scores. For example, youth who were classified as having a hearing impairment or traumatic brain injury received the highest average number of Referral interventions. These findings should be interpreted with caution due to unequal sizes of participants among the 13 groups.

Disability (OSEP)	Core Service Total	Referral	Coaching	FRC support
Autism	15.22	4.38	10.95	3.59
Deaf-Blindness	11.60	3.87	6.53	4.00
Deafness	12.19	4.00	9.19	3.10
Emotional Disturbances	15.01	4.53	10.37	3.53
Hearing Impairment	13.69	8.23	9.54	5.38
Intellectual Disability	16.77	4.84	12.67	3.16
Multiple Disabilities	13.85	3.59	10.88	2.21
Orthopedic Impairment	17.84	5.80	13.82	4.16
Other Health Impairment	10.72	3.93	7.31	2.18
Specific Learning Disability	12.87	3.55	9.73	2.86
Speech or Language Impairment	8.89	2.30	6.15	1.59
Traumatic Brain Injury	23.43	10.86	18.00	5.57
Visual Impairment	9.11	3.68	5.05	1.79
Total	14.09	4.29	10.27	3.01

5. Were there differences in the number of Parent/Guardian Training and Information interventions associated with 'disability' as defined by the five areas of 'function'?

Findings: Yes. There were significant findings for the services of Coaching and FRC Support as well as the Total average for the Core Service area. The shaded

areas in the following table indicate the extreme high and low average scores for each of the three services and the Total average for this Core Service area:

Function	Core Service Total	Referral	Coaching	F.R.C. support
Sensory	10.75	4.01	7.13	2.86
Cognitive/Intellectual	15.40	4.43	11.64	3.08
Affective/Emotional	15.17	4.41	10.82	3.58
Mobility/Health	11.56	4.15	8.08	2.41
Multiple	13.85	3.59	10.88	2.21
Total	14.09	4.29	10.27	3.01

6. Were there differences in the number of Parent/Guardian Training and Information interventions associated with the status of parent/guardian employment at the time of intake?

Findings: Yes. As shown in the table below (shaded area) those who indicated their employment status was 'full-time' received a significantly lower average number of coaching interventions. Beyond that specific characteristic, no significant findings were observed.

Parent/guardian employment	Core Service Total	Referral	Coaching	FRC support
Part-Time	15.19	5.21	11.34	3.32
Full-Time	11.56	3.66	7.91	2.94
Unemployed/look for work	13.18	4.77	9.48	3.25
Homemaker	15.78	4.08	11.77	2.88
Retired	13.61	3.63	10.27	2.76
Other	13.59	4.42	9.74	2.93
Total	14.09	4.29	10.27	3.01

7. Were there differences in the number of Parent/Guardian Training and Information interventions associated with the status of parent/guardian formal education at time of intake (highest degree completed)?

Findings: No. This finding was a surprise to the PE staff, who suspected that the level of formal education might have been associated in some systematic way with the desire to receive these three services.

8. Were there differences in the number of Parent/Guardian Training and Information interventions associated with the youth's expressed expectation to attend college upon high school completion?

Findings: Yes. This was perhaps one of the most pertinent PE findings in this report. As shown in the table below, the youth who expressed an interest to attend college received significantly fewer average number of interventions than those who did not express such aspirations. Note the direction of the difference in all four categories. Is this possibly because they are more independent/self-directed? Or are there some other causal factors that are not captured in the DMS? Can it be assumed that CSCs are directing more of their time and effort towards those families whose youth do not have aspirations to attend college?

Current Post HS expectation by youth to attend college?	Core Service Total	Referral	Coaching	FRC support
No	15.83	4.80	11.48	3.43
Yes	12.60	3.86	9.24	2.65
Total	14.09	4.29	10.27	3.01

9. Were there differences in the number of Parent/Guardian Training and Information interventions associated with the youth's expressed expectation to seek employment upon high school completion?

Findings: No. As shown in the table below, there were no noteworthy differences.

Current Post HS expectation by youth; obtain employment?	Core Service Total	Referral	Coaching	FRC support
No	14.57	4.17	10.80	3.20
Yes	13.64	4.40	9.78	2.84
Total	14.09	4.29	10.27	3.01

10. Were there differences in the number of Parent/Guardian Training and Information interventions associated with the parent/guardian's expressed expectations for their youth to attend college upon high school completion?

Findings: Yes. The findings closely parallel the findings from question 8. As the table below indicates, there were significant differences in all areas except 'Coaching'. Those parents who stated intentions for their youth to attend college received significantly fewer average number of interventions.

Current Post HS expectation by parents; attend college?	Core Service Total	Referral	Coaching	FRC support
No	15.61	4.78	11.14	3.46
Yes	13.09	3.97	9.70	2.71
Total	14.09	4.29	10.27	3.01

11. Were there differences in the number of Parent/Guardian Training and Information interventions associated with the parent/guardians' expressed expectation for their youth to seek employment upon high school completion?

Findings: No. As shown in the table below, there were no noteworthy differences:

Current Post HS expectation by parents; obtain employment?	Core Service Total	Referral	Coaching	FRC support
No	13.92	4.01	10.18	3.11
Yes	14.25	4.56	10.35	2.91
Total	14.09	4.29	10.27	3.01

Other PE Findings - Work Experiences and Parent/Guardian Training

An analysis of the association between the Total number of work experiences per youth and the average number of interventions in the Core Service area of Parent/Guardian Training and Information yielded a curious finding. As shown in the table below, families of the youth who had five work experiences received a significantly greater average number of referral and coaching interventions. The PE staff has no idea why the group of youth with five work experiences has such a different intervention profile than all others. It would be of interest to conduct analyses of the same metric across the other four Core Service areas to determine if this trend persists.

Total number of work experiences	Core Service Total	Referral	Coaching	FRC support
1	14.37	4.03	10.88	2.69
2	12.89	3.87	9.69	2.59
3	15.07	4.60	10.63	3.82
4	13.00	4.26	8.55	3.82
5	26.83	9.40	21.23	3.93
6	14.60	3.70	9.90	2.20
7	8.50	4.40	4.50	2.90
8	19.00	5.00	13.00	4.00
9	2.50	.50	1.50	.50
10	.00	.00	.00	.00
Total	14.13	4.22	10.43	2.96

Summary

This PE examined the association between the Parent/Guardian Information and Training interventions and CaPROMISE youth demographic characteristics, parent/guardian employment and education status, post-high school expectations, and number of work experiences. An analysis of the DMS data revealed significant differences associated with the youth's disability, parent/guardian's employment status, and post-high school expectations. The PE team advises caution interpreting the findings related to a youth's disability due to the unequal distribution across the disability categories. Moreover, severity of disability cannot be inferred from the disability category alone. An unexpected finding was the significantly lower number of interventions received by youth and parents/guardians who expressed the expectation that the youth will attend college. Closer analysis of additional data elements (i.e., high-school completion, other interventions) may provide more insight.

The SDSU Interwork staff of CaPROMISE welcomes your input. Nobody has a better idea of how these findings might be explained than those of you who are 'in the field'. This includes youth and family members, CSCs, Supervisors, DOR personnel, allied agency personnel, and ancillary service providers. We would like to hear from you regarding your ideas about this report as well as ideas for follow-up analyses and future reports.

Please address correspondence about this document to: Mark Tucker, Ph.D., Department of Administration, Rehabilitation and Postsecondary Education, San Diego State University, email: mtucker@sdsu.edu; Mari Guillermo, Ed.D., Interwork Institute, San Diego State University, email: mari_g@interwork.sdsu.edu

Disclaimer: CaPROMISE is funded through a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Grant #H418P130003. The contents of this paper do not necessarily represent the policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.