



**MFP Process Orientation Workshop: Training Evaluation**  
**February 4-5 2013**  
**Macon, Georgia**



**I. Understanding of Training Topic (Day 1)**

Day One Topics	Before Training					After Training					Skipped	(n = 39) +/- Average Change	Comments
	1	2	3	4	*ALU	1	2	3	4	*ALU			
Person Centered Planning	0	0	24	15	3.38	0	0	11	28	3.71	0	+ 33%	Good, but same messages; great examples;
**Logic Model & Project Evaluation	11	16	7	3	1.9	1	9	14	13	2.8	4	+ 90%	Great Work; would like to know more; excellent; Model is complicated
QOL Process	8	6	11	4	1.7	0	8	6	14	2.3	11	+ 60%	Excellent; paperwork illegible;
Referrals-Denials-Terminations	5	11	19	1	2.2	1	9	15	11	2.7	6	+ 50%	Good Information/Not long enough; useful as awareness for TCs; a lot to figure out! Unclear; More questions!
**Dignity of Risk	1	10	23	5	2.8	0	0	12	27	3.6	1	+ 80%	Great! Awesome!
Pre-ITP	10	15	9	4	2.1	0	7	21	8	2.7	4	+ 60%	Forms very user friendly, love new Pre-ITP; very informative; rushed; had more questions;
QOL Reporting	11	6	12	8	2.3	2	6	14	15	2.9	4	+ 60%	How do you report changes?
Waiver Enrollment Process	3	8	21	6	2.7	0	1	15	22	3.4	2	+ 70%	Great! Very helpful; very informative;
**Housing Tools	3	12	20	3	2.5	0	1	17	20	3.4	1	+ 90%	Great Job Jerome!, good resources; will definitely utilize

\*Average Level of Understanding (ALU) = score X number of answers (per category) / by total completing the surveys

\*\* Highest positive increase in understanding – Housing Tools, Logic Model and Project Evaluation and Dignity of Risk.



**MFP Process Orientation Workshop: Training Evaluation**  
**February 4-5 2013**  
**Macon, Georgia**



**II. Overall Evaluation (Day 1)**

Aspect of Training	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Skipped	Total Responses	Combined A+SA/Total
Usefulness	0	2	26	8	3	36	94%
Met Needs	0	3	26	7	3	36	91%
Quality	0	3	25	8	3	36	91%
Length	2	3	24	7	3	34	86%
Presenters Helpful	0	1	23	12	3	36	97%
Presenters Knowledgeable	0	1	23	12	3	36	97%
Application	0	1	28	7	3	36	97%

Overall training participants either agreed or agreed strongly that training presentation were helpful, presenters were knowledgeable and that participants would be able to apply what they learned at the workshop.

**Please explain any “strongly disagree” and “disagree” responses above.**

- Revise forms to include lines to write on
- lunch without a Speaker is nice sometime
- Always allow for questions-no screaming!
- Good introduction to the process! Learned more about the acronyms and the terminology in the small group sessions! Screening and ITP training was too short for such important changes
- Need all handouts/power point ahead of time/makes it more meaningful and easier to take notes and learn more!
- Need Table of Contents! Difficult to locate materials;
- Very Good Training
- Need more info on denials /terminations, when and why?
- More statistics in appeals; hearings;
- JW, Amy, Cheryl, always positive speakers
- RL, great job moving thing along!
- Other than Screening did not apply to me as an OC
- Presenters needed to be more specific; needed more practical application to the field within realms of funding allocations.
- Suggestions/Questions were not appreciated or wanted
- Needed to ask more questions



**MFP Process Orientation Workshop: Training Evaluation**  
**February 4-5 2013**  
**Macon, Georgia**



**I. Understanding of Training Topic (Day 2)**

Day Two Topics	Before Training					After Training					(n = 36)		Comments
	1	2	3	4	*ALU	1	2	3	4	*ALU	Skipped	+/- Average Change	
**Post –ITP (new process)	6	18	7	4	2.1	0	3	20	13	3.2	0	+ 110%	Great Information! Not sure how this is beneficial; Need to actually complete one; I appreciate the increased flexibility; Need more discussion; breakout sessions were not helpful; I like the scenario and how to apply it to ITP process; Complicated Forms Very Helpful! OCs unfamiliar with this; Great exercises; -Hard to understand, but adorable! Informative but confusing; I would like this presentation at a later date; Confusing Great Job! Good Speaker!
New MFP Services:	7	17	9	2	2.1	0	5	14	16	3.2	0	+ 110%	
Care Giver Outreach/T-Care	3	17	13	2	2.3	0	4	16	15	3.2	1	+ 90%	
Vendor Payments	10	7	11	6	2.2	1	5	12	17	3.1	0	+ 90%	
Family Conflict Management	3	7	14	9	2.6	1	2	12	18	3.1	4	+ 50%	
Home Care Ombudsman (new)	6	6	17	5	2.4	0	7	18	9	2.8	4	+ 40%	
Supported Employment (new)	13	12	10	0	1.8	1	16	14	3	2.4	2	+ 60%	
Reporting	3	10	14	3	2.1	0	7	10	12	2.5	10	+ 40%	

\*Average Level of Understanding (ALU) = score X number of answers (per category) / by total completing the surveys

\*\* Highest positive increase in understanding – Post-ITP, New MFP Services (TCARE) and Vendor Payments.



**MFP Process Orientation Workshop: Training Evaluation**  
**February 4-5 2013**  
**Macon, Georgia**



**II. Overall Evaluation (Day 2)**

Overall	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Skipped	Total Responses	Combined A+SA/Total
Usefulness	0	2	20	5	2	27	92%
Met Needs	0	3	23	6	2	32	90%
Quality	0	2	21	8	3	31	93%
Length	0	2	24	7	2	33	93%
Presenters Helpful	0		25	7	2	32	100%
Presenters Knowledgeable	0	1	22	7	4	30	96%
Application	0	2	19	9	4	30	93%

Regarding the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of training, participants either agreed or agreed strongly that training presentation were helpful, presenters were knowledgeable and that participants would be able to apply what they learned at the workshop.

**Please explain any “strongly disagree” and “disagree” responses above.**

- More info on Tools for Life and hands-on seminar/adaptive equipment -Good Training! Excellent Workshop!
- I am more confused!
- Need OC/TC breakout session
- Please listen to us in the field, we would benefit from an understanding partnership-consider the issues and time constraints that put pressure on us;
- Training too specific to TCs;
- How do LTCOs help TCs and participants pre and post?
- A lot of Good Information at once!
- Great timing
- A Few items needed more attention (discussion)