SAFE: Stopping Abuse For Everyone

Through the use of these instruments, agencies are able to collect progressive and aggregate data (short-term and long-term) and to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of ongoing programs. Additionally, these instruments serve to monitor fidelity and adherence to evidence-supported practices and to provide valuable guidance for adjustments in future case planning and supervision efforts.

Evaluation and assessment instruments created for the *SAFE Interactive Journaling® Program* have been for both participants and program providers/facilitators. They incorporate specific instruments to measure participant progress and include instruments to measure provider fidelity and adherence to journal exercises and material (through direct observation by trained observers, participant assessment, etc.).

Through the use of the evaluation and assessment instruments, participants will gain valuable insight and feedback into their ongoing progress during their journaling experiences. For program facilitators and agencies, these evaluation and assessment instruments will provide far-reaching data from which quantitative and qualitative measures of the journaling process can be assessed.

The following guidelines are set forth to assist in the measurement and analysis of data collected in evaluation and assessment instruments for the *SAFE Interactive Journaling® Program*.

Instructions for Use

I. Definitions

Unique Client ID: This number is either self-assigned by the participant or assigned by the facilitator. The number may be a unique identifier such as a case number or birthday, or randomly chosen numbers can be used. Be sure the ID number is at least six digits long and is unique to that individual. Also be sure that this ID number matches for the pre-test, post-test and evaluation of facilitator. Essentially this is the participant's name, but in a way that is kept confidential.

Facilitator: This is the name of the individual facilitating the sessions.

Date Completed: The day the assessment was completed.

Program Name: The supervising agency, county and/or district in which the participant is sentenced or where services are being delivered.

Assessment Type: Administer the pre-test before participants begin any work in their Interactive Journals. Administer the post-test as participants complete their Journals in the final module. Once participants have completed the program, administer the Course Evaluation. Because the pre-test and the post-test are the same form, indicate which assessment type is being measured at the top of the form.

<u>Sessions completed:</u> The number of sessions that have been completed when administering the test.

II. Forms

There are two types of forms. These are indicated at the top of each form.

1. <u>Participant Evaluation</u> – These forms (pre-test and post-test) are to be completed by the participant and are a self-evaluation which measures changes in knowledge, skills and attitudes in the specific topic areas of the *SAFE Interactive Journaling® Program*. Administer the pre-test before beginning the program. It is recommended that the post-test be conducted during the last module, once the Interactive Journal has been completed.

2. <u>Evaluation of Facilitator</u> – These forms can be completed by the participant (Participant Evaluation of Facilitator) and/or by a supervisor (Supervisor Evaluation of Facilitator). These forms measure how well facilitators adhere to the rules of *Interactive Journaling®* and fidelity to program delivery. These should be administered at the end of the program once the Interactive Journal and all modules have been completed.

III. Scoring

In all participant evaluation forms, the user has a selection between *Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree* and *Strongly Disagree* for each question. For scoring, each of these responses is translated or coded to a number.

<div align="center">

Coding:
Strongly Agree = 1
Agree = 2
Disagree = 3
Strongly Disagree = 4

</div>

Most questions are phrased such that *Strongly Agree* is the most desirable response (i.e., I know the parts of the cognitive chain, I have plans in place to cope with high-risk situations).

Some questions, however, are phrased such that *Strongly Disagree* is the most desirable response (i.e., I am here because the system is not fair, My partner should be here instead of me). In order to properly align the scores, these questions will be reverse coded.

<div align="center">

Reverse Coding:
Strongly Agree = 4
Agree = 3
Disagree = 2
Strongly Disagree = 1

</div>

In the evaluation of facilitator form, the user has a selection between *Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree* and *Strongly Disagree* for each question. For scoring, each of these responses is translated or coded to a number.

<div align="center">

Coding:
Strongly Agree = 1
Agree = 2
Disagree = 3
Strongly Disagree = 4

</div>

Most questions are phrased such that *Strongly Agree* is the most desirable response (i.e., I know the parts of the cognitive chain, I have plans in place to cope with high-risk situations).

Some questions, however, are phrased such that *Strongly Disagree* is the most desirable response (i.e., I am here because the system is not fair, My partner should be here instead of me). In order to properly align the scores, these questions will be reverse coded.

<div align="center">

Reverse Coding:
Strongly Agree = 4
Agree = 3
Disagree = 2
Strongly Disagree = 1

</div>

Calculating Averages
For the participant evaluation forms, calculate and compare the average pre-test score and the average post-test score. (Don't forget about your reverse-coded items). Find the average by adding the scores for all questions on the form, then divide by the total number of questions.

For the evaluation of facilitator form, find the average by adding the scores for all questions on the form, then divide by the total number of questions.

IV. Interpreting Scores

Interpreting Participant Evaluations
Qualitative comparisons can be made from pre-test to post-test using the following definitions.

Scores of 1. The participant is maintaining the positive behaviors associated with this topic area. Participants are consistently able to recognize, understand and confidently apply prosocial learned skills.

Scores of 2. Further practice is desirable, however, participants possess and have begun demonstrating the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary for maintaining positive behavior changes. On average, participants are capable, with minimal difficulty, to recognize and understand prosocial values. It is encouraged that participants continue to practice and make adjustments to skill implementation.

Scores of 3. Further development is required. Participants have not demonstrated the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary for making positive behavior changes. Participants have shown consistent difficulty with recognizing and understanding prosocial knowledge and attitudes. Participants have little to no behavior changes to speak of.

Scores of 4. There are significant skill and knowledge deficits preventing participants from making positive behavior changes. There is a major inability to recognize, understand and apply prosocial behaviors.

Ideally, participants will average between 1 and 2 on their post-tests.

Interpreting Evaluations of Facilitator

1 – Skill evidenced at superior level

The facilitator consistently demonstrates the skill to a high standard throughout the session. A score of 1 represents highly proficient performance with the facilitator demonstrating superior group facilitation skills.

2 – Skill evidenced at above average level

The facilitator shows skilled performance in session delivery, showing very minor areas for improvement. A score of 2 represents competent performance. Areas for improvement will be very minor and based on enhancing skills that are already apparent and delivered to good effect in the group process.

2.5 – Skill evidenced at average level

The skill is demonstrated consistent with curriculum, behavior change approach and *Interactive Journaling*® model, with minor areas for improvement. A score of 2.5 indicates that the facilitator runs the session as intended but can improve.

Examples:

a. Participants are generally encouraged to make links between journaling exercises and personal issues/goals but the facilitator may miss some opportunities.
b. The facilitator demonstrates adequate listening and motivational skills and adequate use of open-ended questions, but occasionally fails to do so.
c. Reinforcement/verbal rewards are generally given when appropriate, but on occasion the facilitator may fail to comment on important contributions or learning.
d. Consistent use of Facilitator Guide and *Interactive Journaling*® strategies.

3 – Skill evidenced at below average level

The skill is delivered with some adherence to the Facilitator Guide, Interactive Journal facilitation strategies or group work/individual skills, but with significant areas for improvement.

Examples:

a. The session objectives are covered, but some exercises/activities are shortened (or deleted) for no apparent reason.
b. The facilitator shows some use of an open questioning style, but predominantly uses closed-ended questions.
c. The facilitator relies primarily on lecture style; participants not regularly engaged in discussion or interaction. Use of *Interactive Journaling*® strategies, read, respond, share and receive feedback, is inconsistent.
d. If co-facilitated, facilitators work collaboratively during the session, but often work poorly in collaboration.

4 – Skill level undermines program integrity

The facilitator has major skill deficiencies to the extent that the integrity of the curriculum and *Interactive Journaling*® model is seriously undermined.

Examples:

a. Inaccurate or misleading explanations of exercises are given, indicating that the facilitator does not understand the underlying principles of behavior change.
b. The facilitator may model offense-supporting, antisocial or discriminatory attitudes.
c. The facilitator shows persistent competency deficits throughout the sessions: tending to use a lecturing style, failing to actively engage participants or encourage them to explore issues for themselves, consistently using closed-ended questions.
d. Failure to regularly use *Interactive Journaling*® strategies: read, respond, share and receive feedback; does not use Facilitator Guide.
e. Poor skills are persistently demonstrated in the dynamics between the facilitator and the individual (individual application) or between the facilitator and the group (group application). For example, engaging in long, open discussions with individual participants on topics unrelated to goals and objectives of the program.