

REFLECTIONS ON QRIS EVALUATION – Quality for ME

Muskie School of Public Service

PRESENTATION – US DHHS CCRP CONFERENCE (10/21/2010)

Acknowledgements to:

- Patti Wooley, ME DHHS
- Kris Michaud, ME DHHS
- Sheryl Peavey, ME DHHS
- Alan Cobo-Lewis, UM
- Allyson Dean, USM
- Sarah Rawlings, USM
- Deb Richards, USM



UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN MAINE

VALIDATING COMPONENTS OF A QRIS

QRIS COMPONENTS (2010, *Compendium of Quality Rating Systems and Evaluations*):

- **QUALITY STANDARDS**
- **PROCESS FOR MONITORING OR ASSIGNING RATINGS BASED ON THE STANDARDS**
- **SUPPORTS FOR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT**
- **FINANCIAL INCENTIVE**
- **DISSEMINATION OF RATINGS TO PARENTS
OTHER CONSUMERS (FAMILY SUPPORT /
FAMILY ENGAGEMENT)**

VALIDATION FRAMEWORK

Construct Validity (Trochim, 2010):

- Involves generalizing from your program or measures to the concept of your program or measures.

Two Types of Construct Validity:

- Translation Validity – Face and or Content Validity
- Criterion Validity – Predictive, Concurrent, Convergent and or Discriminant Validity

Validating QRIS Standards

Demonstrating Translation Validity (Face / Content) Results in Program Managers and Stakeholders “Buying In” to the Standards and the Arrangement of Standards; e.g. Step One Type Programs Considered a Lower Level of Quality Compared to Step Three.

Demonstrating Criterion Validity (Predictive) Results in Program Managers and Stakeholders Ability to Consider the Influence of Various Levels of Quality Settings on Outcomes – Child Functioning, Family Support and Engagement, etc.

Quality for ME - Standards

Translation Validity: Literature Reviews, Focus Groups, Interviews and Surveys with Providers and Parents, Alignment with Accreditation Standards, State-Wide Meetings for Review and Comment, and Pilot Testing.

- Context is one of *Continuous Improvement* so expectation is that the Standards will change over time.

Quality for ME – Validity of Standards

STEP LEVEL	FCCH ERS MEAN SCORES	CBC ERS MEAN SCORES
ONE	3.12 – 3.64 (n = 24)	3.57 – 4.27 (n=26)
TWO	3.00 – 3.78 (n=19)	3.29 – 4.46 (n=13)
THREE	3.20 – 4.28 (n=14)	3.82 – 4.42 (n=22)
FOUR	3.49 – 4.43 (n=15)	3.96 – 4.37 (n=38)

QRIS and Performance Management

“Performance management in the public sector is an ongoing, systematic approach to improving results through evidence-based decision making, continuous organizational learning, and a focus on accountability for performance. Performance management is integrated into all aspects of an organization’s management and policy-making processes, transforming an organization’s practices so it is focused on achieving improved results for the public”.

(National Performance Management Advisory Commission, p. 3, 2010).

Reflections....

- Evaluation Design for QRISs should consider both types of validity. Translation Validity critical for Stakeholder buy-in and is a first step. Criterion Validity results in a more sophisticated evaluation design and maturation of QRIS Standards and or Components.
- Results of QRIS Evaluation Used by Program Managers for Performance Management. Focus is on both accountability and making logical arguments for the influence of the system on outcomes.
- QRIS evaluation plans can include activities to support agency capacity building for data analysis and reporting.
- QRIS evaluation activities can support improving the quality of data for an agency.
- QRIS evaluation activities can support agency efforts to increase accountability and or program monitoring.