Using Formative Evaluation to Develop a Facilitation Skills Training for Youth Program Educators

Tuesday, January 4, 2022

2:00-3:00 p.m. ET

Webinar Transcript

Jean Knab

Great. Hi everyone. Thank you for joining our webinar today. I hope everyone got some time off over the holidays and didn't get sick, although I'm sure some of the folks on this call did, based on people I've been talking to today. I am Jean Knab. I am the project director of OPA's Evaluation Technical Assistance Contract. Today, I'm going to be talking about a formative evaluation that we actually recently conducted to develop a facilitation skills curriculum for youth program educators. And the process that we used is very similar to what many of you are doing or could do to develop and refine your programs, so we thought it would be useful to share our experience.

So, just to make sure everyone is on the same page with terminology, when I use the term formative evaluation, I mean evaluation work undertaken early in the development of a program or a policy to identify the barriers and facilitators of implementation and to determine whether the program appears to be working. Then you'd use those results of the formative evaluation to feed back into the program, improve the materials or the implementation or the clarity of your policy, or improve whatever type of intervention you're developing before you would move on to conducting the summative evaluation, at which point you're interested in determining the effectiveness of that program. I'll get into more detail in a few minutes about the approach that we took to this evaluation and how our approach roughly mapped to the phases of your grant program.

Before we dive in, please mute your line if you haven't already. We'll open the floor for questions at the end, and you can also feel free to drop questions into the chat.

So, some quick background on our study: our goal was to design and refine a facilitation skills training curriculum for facilitators who provide Healthy Marriage and Relationship Education programming through grants provided by the Office of Family Assistance, or OFA, though we were hoping that the final product could be used by anyone who provided youth programming. The work was conducted as part of a contract for the Administration for Children and Families that included other activities, including conducting randomized controlled trials of specific Healthy Marriage and Relationship Education programs.

So, before we dive into the curriculum development and refinement process, I'll give you a little bit of background on Healthy Marriage and Relationship Education, or HMRE, programs. They're very similar to TPP programs. They provide services to improve relationship skills and increase healthy socioemotional development during adolescence and into adulthood. Many of them have content that overlaps with TPP.
So, many of these HMRE programs have content that overlaps with TPP programs, and the facilitators of these programs would face many of the same challenges in the classroom as TPP programs. Typically, these programs are delivered in high schools or community-based settings, and the programs usually rely on defined curricula that are about 10 to 20 hours long and involve a mix of teacher-led instruction and more interactive small group discussion, roleplays, and skill-building activities.

So why did we develop a facilitation skills training? In talking with HMRE providers through the broader stream study, we heard that one of the main challenges that facilitators face in the classroom is keeping youth engaged in the material no matter what curriculum that they're using.

Facilitators noted things like fatigue and behavioral challenges made it hard for youth to connect with material and stay engaged. In addition, because these programs are about relationship skills, it's really important for these facilitators to quickly build strong relationships with youth to get buy-in, but these programs are often delivered by an outside facilitator or health educator that just kind of drops in and provides this programming. So, it can be really hard for them to come into the classroom and build that connection with youth over a really short period of time. So, relationship-building is also a challenge for them. But most of the HMRE programs that we talked to informally provided only curriculum-specific training. They only trained facilitators on the content of the specific curriculum that they were providing, and they didn't provide much training on enhancing general facilitation skills that could be applied to any curriculum and could help with some of these challenges. So, that's where this work came in.

Our goal was to address these challenges by designing and testing a facilitation skills training curriculum that could be used by Healthy Marriage and Relationship Education supervisors and facilitators. We partnered with two Office of Family Assistance grantees and a master facilitator to develop the curriculum. To structure the work, we used the Learn, Innovate, Improve, or LI^2, process that some of you heard us talk about at our kickoff meeting, and I'll talk more about in a minute. But you could accomplish the same goals with other continuous quality improvement frameworks as well. Finally, we wanted to make sure that we documented the lessons learned along the way and shared those with the field so that they understood the process and data that supported this particular curriculum that we created but also as a case study for how others could use data for program innovation and refinement.

So, as I mentioned, to conduct the formative evaluation, we used the Learn, Innovate, Improve, or LI^2, framework as the model. You can see it depicted on the slide. It's basically a three-step continuous quality improvement process to help programs design and iteratively test program improvements. A principle of LI^2 not shown here is that the process is really grounded in the collaboration between practitioners and researchers, and the goal of LI^2 is to develop research-informed solutions.

The first phase is called the Learn phase, which involves identifying the problems that practitioners face and what they're trying to achieve or what gap they want to fill. This is roughly equivalent to the Explore part of your Explore and Develop phase. The second phase is the Innovate phase, which involves developing research-informed solutions to these challenges guided by a roadmap for change, which is similar to a logic model. I'll show you an example later. The roadmap for change specifies the targeted behaviors to change, the potential strategies to use, and the specific outcomes to measure. The Innovate phase is very similar to the Develop phase, which some of you are in with at least some of your interventions.

Finally, the Improve phase of the framework involves repeatedly road-testing or piloting the solutions that you created during the Innovate phase and collecting data to inform further refinement of the solutions. This is similar to your test and refine phase. In our case, we conducted three cycles or rounds of training and road-testing over the course of the evaluation, and I'll talk more about that in a minute.

So, instead of using the LI^2 terminology, I will use the terminology that aligns with this grant program. First, I will talk about the work that we did in the Explore phase. So, the first step in our development process was to learn more about the Healthy Marriage and Relationship Education programs and the challenges they face. We knew generally from talking to them what some of the challenges were, but we really needed to go deeper so that we could develop a curriculum that really met their needs. So, we undertook a study that asked the following questions. First, what are the characteristics of their programs? What do they look like, the size, the settings, the characteristics of the youth they serve? Do they use a single facilitator or a co-facilitation model?

Next, we asked what types of trainings facilitators receive on topics other than the specific curricula they'll be implementing. Really, the goal of this is to fill the gaps that aren't already well-covered by training they already receive. We wanted to learn more about the supervision facilitators receive. For instance, do they receive group and individual supervision? Do supervisors observe and provide feedback? Do the supervisors, when they do observations, use fidelity checklists or other observation tools? And, finally, we needed to learn more about the challenges they face and the supports they need. For instance, did they need training on broad facilitation skills, classroom management, or working with specific populations?

To answer these questions, we conducted semistructured interviews with eight grantees. For each grantee, we talked to both the grantee project directors and the facilitators. Here are some of the main things that we learned, some of which I've alluded to already. Nearly all grantees reported that they had not yet provided targeted training to build skills for effective facilitation beyond a little bit of classroom management training. That was really the only thing that we heard generally folks did.

The most common challenge was sustaining youth engagement. Grantees wanted training and support on managing youth interaction in the classroom. For instance, how to deal with youth who talk too much or youth who talk too little. Especially in school-based settings, implementing with fidelity within a short class session often made building strong connections with youth difficult. They didn't have time to sort of veer off course and do more social activities. So, they wanted ideas for that and how to integrate that into the curriculum itself. Several grantees expressed a need for support to create culturally safe spaces and build a climate of trust for youth from diverse communities.

So, we took all the information that we learned from those interviews, and, with the grantees, we came up with a set of potential curriculum topics to address the challenges that they face and fill gaps in the field. Some of the topics were focused on broad facilitation skills, like participant-centered facilitation, and some were more targeted, focusing on specific issues in the classroom, such as building trust, trauma-informed facilitation, and managing energy in the classroom. There was also one focused on helping these external health educators manage relationships with school staff, and one focused on supervising and coaching facilitators. So, the next step for us was going to be to talk with the two grantees who would be helping us develop and test the curriculum to determine which topics were most pressing for them since we didn't have time to develop materials for all of these topics.

We used human-centered design activities with the two grantees, again, including staff at all levels, to narrow down and prioritize the topics we would develop into curriculum modules. Here are the three topics that we selected for development and testing. The first training would be on Managing Energy, which was designed to increase facilitators' knowledge and understanding of the daily energy cycle and how to use specific techniques for managing and resetting energy in the classroom for both youth and for themselves.

In the second training, Debriefing and Drawing Out Teachable Moments, training facilitators use debriefing questions to guide discussions, draw out insights, and help youth connect lesson content to their lives. And then, finally, Building Trust was designed to help facilitators build trust with youth and challenge youth to begin exploring new skills and behaviors. Coincidentally, and it really was a coincidence, both sites selected the same set of topics and in the same order, and they did this independently, but that made us feel really confident that these issues are common challenges in the classroom and that this work would fill a gap in the field and that ultimately our curriculum would be very valuable to a broad range of grantees.

So, next, we moved into the Develop phase, but, first, I need to give you a little bit of background on the design for our Test and Refine phase because it influenced our development work. We had about 18 months to conduct the development and testing work. Ideally, we would have had access to a lot of facilitators and been able to train a small number of them on each topic, let them practice with the strategies that they learned, get feedback, refine the training and materials, train a new set of facilitators, and then repeat that process. And then, after refining a couple of times, do a larger-scale test to look at outcomes. But we didn't have access to a large number of facilitators, so we had to come up with a plan that would allow us to learn as much as we could given the time constraints and the number of facilitators available to us.

The way that our process rolled out is that we conducted the formative evaluation across three semesters. In semester one, or cycle one as we called it, the grantees were trained in Managing Energy, and they applied those skills to the classroom, so the strategies that they learned during that training. In cycle two, they were trained in Debriefing. So, at the beginning of that cycle, they were trained in Debriefing and then, during that semester, they applied both the Debriefing skills they learned and the Managing Energy skills they had learned the prior semester. And then, in cycle three, they learned about Building Trust and applied all three sets of skills in the classroom.

One of the obvious drawbacks of this approach is that when we were collecting data on Building Trust, for instance, we really couldn't parse out the effects of just the Building Trust module because the facilitators had been trained in the two other types of strategies and continued to use those. So, we wouldn't know if better youth engagement was because they did a good job managing energy or debriefing versus building trust.

The goal of this work was really formative. So, the most important part of this process is that we get feedback on the training and how well the strategies and tools appeared to be working in the classroom so that we could improve the curriculum and get it ready for full-scale testing. Determining the impact of each strategy was not the goal of the work. So, while, even in formative work, you want to implement the strongest design that you can, the key is really that you're learning and that you're using that information for improvement.

Some people may have a situation with enough available sample that they could use a rigorous design like random assignment of youth or sites to different program changes and test those effects formally. Others may need to rely on a small convenient sample, and that's okay at this stage. You just really want to be thoughtful about your design and your measures so that you get useful data to feed back into the program.

So, just a little bit about the data we collected, which we collected frequently and through different sources throughout the formative evaluation. Most of the data that we collected was qualitative, especially during program improvement. You know, it's important to not only get quantitative data but also get lots of qualitative data that provides concrete suggestions for the things to improve or specific changes to make.

First, during each of the three cycles, we conducted two rounds of individual phone interviews with both facilitators and supervisors. The first one was right after the training, and then we did another one about a month later. So, during the calls, we asked about the training. For instance, was the length and format sufficient to learn the materials? [Were] they were actually using the strategies they learned in the classroom? [Did they face] any challenges in implementing those strategies that they learned? And [did they think] the strategies appeared to be working? During those calls, they also offered suggestion for improvements on the training and any of the materials.

Second, during each cycle, a member of the evaluation team conducted two rounds of in-person observations in each site to understand how facilitators were applying the strategies in the classroom, assess areas for individual improvement, provide feedback to facilitators, and share feedback with supervisors on how to monitor and coach the facilitators themselves. These observation data also really gave us great insights into areas of improvement for the training materials, for instance, by providing more guidance for strategies that we could see were harder for the facilitators to implement well.

Third, we had facilitators fill out periodic surveys about which of the strategies they used on a particular day, what their perception of youth’s response to them was, whether they faced any challenges implementing them, and if they had any suggestions for improvements. So, [they were] similar questions to the interviews, but the goal was to get this data while it was really fresh in their minds and not wait for the next interview. We used this quantitative data to help develop questions and probes for our interviews in end-of-cycle discussions.

At the end of each cycle, we conducted debriefing discussions with site staff, and we did this separately with each site to reflect on the feedback we received from facilitators and supervisors as well as our own observation. We talked about suggestions that they had or we had for improving the curriculum based on a semester or more of using the strategies and made a plan for implementing those. While the facilitators didn’t get a full training again, so we didn’t repeat the Managing Energy training again because they had already been trained in it, we did provide feedback individually and as a group, and we revised some of the supplementary materials, like handouts and the supervisor observation form. So, in the next cycle, they provided feedback on any revisions we made to the materials or any new tips or strategies we provided and how well those strategies worked or how easy or hard they were to implement.

Finally, we examined possible changes in youth outcomes through data collected at program entry and exit that grantees had to collect from youth as part of their grant requirements. For reasons I won’t get into, we did not collect data from youth as part of our study, but we were able to take data that was already being collected for other purposes that could be useful to us, and we encourage you to look for opportunities to use existing data when it’s available and relevant.

In our case, we compared responses for cohorts of youth who received the program before any training occurred with cohorts of youth who got the program after any training occurred to see if there were any improvements on two different measures. First, there was a measure that asked youth how much they thought the program helped them—just a very straight-forward measure. And then, second, there was a three-item scale that measured perceived changes in relationship skills.

So, before we move into the curriculum development, I wanted to make sure you have a sense of who is involved and their roles, our partnerships, and making sure that everyone who contributed and had a voice was really central to this process. Staff at the two grantee sites, Catholic Charities of Wayne County, New York, and Youth and Family Services in Rapid City, South Dakota, were really critical in helping identify the initial challenges and needs. They got trained in the curriculum, and they provided us frequent feedback while testing the strategies in the classroom.

Mathematica's role was to facilitate the formative piece through LI^2. We collected and analyzed the data and condensed and consolidated the feedback and insights we learned over time to identify refinements for the training curriculum. Finally, our training partner, Public Strategies, designed and adapted the training curriculum, conducted the trainings, made numerous trips to each site, observed the facilitators and supervisors in action, and provided feedback to the staff on strengthening their facilitation skills.

All right. So, let's dive in a bit more to the process that we used for curriculum development. At the beginning of each of the three cycles, we convened a strategic planning discussion with each site. The goals were to pick the training topic, and I've already mentioned which ones we picked, and then to get very granular about the issues the training should address or provide strategies for, and then identify what success would look like in the classroom if those strategies worked and how we could measure that for the formative evaluation.

These initial meetings included program directors, supervisors, facilitators, and members of the evaluation team from Mathematica and Public Strategies, and it was really important to have all voices in the room to share their perspectives and be part of the development process. Even though we had a master facilitator at Public Strategies that was taking the lead on writing and revising the curriculum, the grantees had a lot of input to share on the issues they face and need strategies for [as well as] potential strategies to try out in the classroom, particularly for the Managing Energy and Building Trust modules.

We spent a lot of time talking about the specific challenges they face in the classroom, and then we developed a roadmap for change, which, again, is like a logic model, and I'll show you an example on the next slide. The goal of this was to identify the strategies the curriculum module could include, the targeted behaviors that ideally would change as a result of those strategies, and then the longer-term outcomes that would define success. This roadmap was then used to guide the curriculum development and helped us identify the data that we would collect during the process.

This is just a sample of the roadmap for change. It's just a portion of the roadmap for change for Managing Energy. It was too large to include the whole thing. In the first column are some of the strategies we identified as potential ways to monitor and manage energy in the classroom. For instance, facilitators should start the lesson with high energy. They should use physical strategies like moving around the room and changing the volume of their voice. The training should suggest ways that co-facilitators can work together to monitor the energy of the room and signal each other when they need to adjust the energy level of the room.

Then we talked about the targeted changes we would expect to see from using these strategies. Again, these are the short-term outcomes—things like, did the facilitator use the strategies that they learned? Did they feel comfortable using them? Did youth respond appropriately to them? For instance, if they tried to incorporate a game or activity to manage energy, did the youth cooperate and find it engaging?

We chose very concrete measures that would allow us to learn about whether the training and strategies were useful and how we could potentially improve them. Then, in terms of the longer-term outcomes, we were interested in whether the facilitator had improved confidence in managing energy in the classroom or they had a better working relationship with their co-facilitator. Some other things that we thought might change would be youth attendance, for instance, if in an out-of-school setting, maybe you would see higher attendance if the program quality was higher. Ideally, you would see greater learning of key concepts and a decrease in behavioral issues.

In thinking about the measures and what made sense in this context, we also had to brainstorm about what the benchmarks should be. Because these health educators essentially dropped in on students and didn't teach them all year round, we couldn't ask the youth if the facilitators seemed more engaging before and after they got the training, and we couldn't ask the facilitators whether the same students seemed more engaged before or after the training that they received, since they only taught any particular youth for a short period of time. So, we decided to ask facilitators about whether the participation they were seeing in the classroom was typical, better than typical, or less than typical compared with what they saw before they began using the strategy.

My point in sharing this is that, again, sometimes in a formative evaluation you're not going to be able to measure something perfectly because of time constraints or design constraints and, again, that's okay. As we talked about in the design, the goal is to learn as much as you can and feed that back into the process. So, even if you just have the teacher's perception of whether the youth were better behaved for this work, that's okay. You don't need an objective measure of behavior at this stage of the process. You can work on that when the intervention is ready for someone to test it.

Once we had identified the main training topic to focus on for each cycle, the master trainer took what we heard from staff and developed the training module to identify any potential solutions for the challenges raised. He drew up best practices for the field and evidence on successful facilitation practices, and, as I mentioned, also incorporated strategies suggested by the group. Each training module consisted of short lessons with both conceptual grounding and practical content on the selected topic, interspersed with activities designed for facilitators to model, practice, and engage with the material.

Facilitators really wanted hands-on supplementary materials that they could use in planning and during their sessions, such as checklists or quick tip sheets for them to reference, like a set of energizer activities that they could use in the classroom if youth were waning at some period of time. So, we created those for each module, and we created an observation tool designed for supervisors to monitor and provide feedback to facilitators.

So, now it was time for the road test or the pilot and reviewing the data that we collected. First, both for the facilitator logs and the interviews, staff told us that they were using the strategies, and we could also see that in our observations, and that they really liked the strategies that they learned. Some strategies were certainly easier to implement than others. For instance, the Managing Energy strategy and Building Trust strategies were much easier to learn and use than the Debriefing strategies. So, we knew that we needed to add more content and guidance to the Debriefing module than to the other two modules.

They also felt that youth were responding to the strategies, and they shared some anecdotes with us to help us see how things were working. For instance, one facilitator noted that during a lesson when they were playing a video, youth were pretty rowdy and inattentive. In the next lesson, she tried a strategy for managing energy that had youth take notes on sticky notes during the video, and she really felt like they were more attentive when they did that. So, it was helpful for them to share anecdotes along the way so that we could add more tips and flesh things out in the curriculum for the future. We also did see some evidence from the youth survey data that cohorts of youth who received the program after their facilitator got trained were more likely to say the program was useful to them than cohorts who received it before the facilitators were trained.

All of these outcomes were very positive and encouraging, but, again, the goal of this work was really about making sure the program was as useful as possible and ready for larger-scale distribution. So, the primary focus of our data collection was on how to make the training and materials even better. We talked to staff frequently to get suggestions for updating and refining the training. So, for example, during our first round of calls with facilitators, after the first training, we heard about the need for even more handouts that they could use in the classroom. They also felt like they could have used more hands-on practice during the training, so we provided even more tools to them and also built in structured time for practice and teach-backs, which was essentially doing a mini lesson, and incorporating the strategies learned in subsequent trainings.

Later in each cycle, as they got a chance to get more comfortable with the new facilitation strategies, we heard more about the need to understand how to tailor some of the strategies for particular context, such as activities that work better with older youth versus younger youth or how to implement certain activities when you're constrained in smaller spaces. And they wanted more information about when and how to integrate these activities into the curriculum. We built in a review of the curriculum into the lessons so that, in the future, facilitators would look through their curriculum and suggest which strategies or activities might work well during which lessons in their curriculum. For instance, using an activity to get youth up and moving during a pivotal lesson. In some cases, they had suggestions about which activities worked really well in different situations themselves. They weren't necessarily asking for help; they were saying, I tried this, and this worked really well for us. So, we added that feedback as tips in the curriculum as well.

We also heard about ways to refine the observation tools, which they initially felt were a little bit long and somewhat cumbersome to use. We found ways to streamline that and make it simpler to pick up and use. And at the end of each cycle, again, we brainstormed as a group about applying the feedback, and one of the main messages that came through there is really the importance and value of being intentional and planning for each lesson and thinking ahead about the appropriate strategies that would help them optimize delivery and student engagement. So, we made sure that the training materials really stressed the importance of planning and thinking ahead about how and when to incorporate the strategies into whatever curriculum you're delivering.

At the end of this process, we have a fully fleshed out curriculum that includes the three modules, Managing Energy, Debriefing, and Building Trust. It includes a lot of supplementary tools, handouts, et cetera, and lists of energizer activities and games for facilitators to use. And it also includes guidance for the person who will deliver this training. The training is grounded in evidence. We really felt confident that it fills a gap in the field, and we feel that it is ready for summative testing.

So, stepping back and thinking about the key lessons that we learned from this process, it was really hard to condense because we learned so many things, both content and process related. From the grantees' perspective, staff emphasized how valuable the training and feedback was for them. They felt like it really boosted their confidence by giving them a concrete toolbox of facilitation skills and strategies that they could apply in multiple situations to better engage youth and build trust with them. So, we're optimistic that once this training is available to the public, hopefully this spring, crossing fingers, others can benefit from it as well. Right now, we are working on a dissemination plan to make sure people are aware of the materials and how to access and use them. That's obviously a critical piece in the development process and something that OPA is obviously encouraging you to do along the way as well.

In terms of the formative process, critical to our success was having partners who are willing to learn new skills and share with us what was working and what wasn't working for them. You know, it's not helpful to have folks who are yes men, right? We really needed people to be willing to say this works, this doesn't, and here's how you might make this better. That's how we made this curriculum better and better over time. When developing a curriculum or a policy or a practice, it is unlikely that your first or second draft is well fleshed out enough or clear enough or easy enough to implement. Having people provide actionable feedback is critical to the successful innovation process.

Using a structured framework like LI^2 really helped to ground us in terms of our approach to collecting data, being thoughtful about what to collect, how much data we would need, how often to collect it, how best to use it to refine the training and build on what we learned in each cycle. Hearing from folks on the ground about their needs and what success looks like was really critical for us to be able to deliver a product of maximum value.

It was really important for us not to get hung up on having a perfect design or perfect measures. Doing that would have been cost- and time-prohibitive. Being constrained to an 18-month development period forced us to come up with the best design and measures we could under the circumstances, and move forward. And we learned a lot, even without a perfect design, largely from the set of structured, open-ended questions that we asked of facilitators.

Finally, having an expert involved was critical. Our partner at Public Strategies was a master facilitator, grounded in the science of facilitation but also with many years of experience. Having a key partner that could draw on evidence and best practices, both for the initial draft for the curriculum but also when trying to improve the sticking points, was really important to the success of this effort.

The formative evaluation report from this work is not available yet but hopefully will be soon, along with the curriculum. There are resources available for you on formative evaluation and the Learn, Innovate, Improve framework. We have already shared these with you by email previously, but I will link them again here in the slides, and we will post these slides for you on the RHNTC site soon once we get them 508'd and get the recording. In the meantime, if you have any questions, you should feel free to reach out to me. You can also reach out to your Mathematica liaisons with general questions, so Lauren, Russ, Kay, or Emily. And that is it. So, now we'll open it up for questions. I'm happy to answer questions on the process. I'm happy to share more about the curriculum. "Do you remember what human-centered design activities were used for the strategic planning meetings?" Yes. We used a number of different activities. For the one that we used for prioritization, we had a lot of people in the room, and they had a lot of different perspectives on which of the curriculum should be the priority topic. So, we used a bullseye activity where everybody got to essentially put one number one, so their top priority topic, in the center of the bullseye, and then they got to put two, their second two choices in sort of the second ring of the bullseye. And then we used that to see which topics rose to the top, either as sort of a first or second choice.

As I mentioned, there was agreement across the two sites on the topics. And I would say, generally, there was pretty much universal agreement within each site on the three topics. It was more about the order. Some of them, you know, wanted to do one of the topics first. They wanted to do Building Trust versus Managing Energy, but, for the most part, within each site and across sites, there was probably 75 percent agreement on which topics they felt like would be most useful to them.

Yes, we can paste the links from the last slide into the chat. Lauren, can you do that? And then I will answer Lizzy. So, actually, for the other human-centered design activities, we did use Rose, Bud, Thorn to help the grantees identify which things they thought they were already pretty good at and which things they thought they were kind of good at but really with a little boost could get very good at, and one of those things happened to be co-facilitation. Both of these grantees used a co-facilitation model for their curriculum. Our curriculum ended up spending more time on co-facilitation than we expected, but they really felt like that was super useful for them, and it was something that isn't covered in sort of just general classroom management, other trainings that some of them might have received or during graduate school. So, that was something that was particularly useful for them, teaching them how to work well together as a team.

	Lizzy asked, "What are some of the factors folks should consider when identifying and testing the best CQI innovation framework for their approach?" Do you mean like how to choose the right framework? Why did we choose LI^2? Yes. So, I think, first, you picked the one that somebody on the team is familiar with. I would say a lot of these are very similar. They have similar procedures with some small tweaks. So, first, I would say pick the one that people are familiar with, and we were familiar with LI^2. But that said, one of the reasons that we developed LI^2 was that it was really focused on this partnership between researchers and practitioners. So, not going it alone as a researcher, not going it alone as a practitioner, really that partnership between the two to make sure that you were bringing in the practitioner perspective when creating measures and, similarly, bringing in the research side. Really making sure there was a partnership there and that the solutions were research informed, both from the data that you collect during the process but also prior to starting the process. Bringing in evidence on good facilitation practices that already exist in the field and sort of not just starting from scratch using the research that already exists out there. So, that's why we chose that one, but, generally, I would say, if you're an expert in Plan, Do, Study, Act, use that one and teach that one to your team and use that one as your structure. I put in the chat the LI^2 link. The formative evaluation and the implementation toolkit link is on Max. So, I could – it's a –.
Lauren Scher	It only works in Chrome, yeah.
Jean Knab	I could copy that in, if folks want me to.
Lauren Scher	Yeah, I think it's a hidden link on Max, if I'm correct, and Lizzy might know this. It used to be on that page that doesn't exist anymore, that general research page, which I think is still there but isn't easy to get to. Again, I tried to do that in Edge, and it did not work, so I think you need to use Chrome for that one. And I believe that that toolkit will be on the RHNTC site at some point. We should double back on that, Lizzy. Great. Lizzy said the toolkit is now under the guidance section.
Jean Knab	Any other questions? "Over what time period did we conduct this work?" We conducted this work over roughly an 18-month period. I think it was the fall of 2018 through the end of fall of 2019 when we were sort in the classroom with the facilitators. We were just wrapping up the materials. Now they are under a second or third or fourth round of review at OPRE now.

If you have any follow-up questions, you should feel free to reach out to me at any time. I hope when these materials are public, you will hear about them through OPA. We're also going to develop some companion pieces. So, the final product is a curriculum that potentially a lead supervisor would provide to their team, but we're also planning on doing some condensed versions of the materials for people who sort of wouldn't be able to receive the training but still benefit from learning some of the tips and tricks. Again, we're hoping that comes out this spring.

So, thank you all. We look forward to continuing to work with you. The next webinar will be on the feasibility of impact evaluations, in February. Lauren, is the date the fourth?

Lauren Scher — It is the --.

Jean Knab — Second?

Lauren Scher — Second.

Jean Knab — Second. Okay.

Lauren Scher — Yep, second, at 2:00 P.M. Eastern.

Jean Knab — Great. So, we will see you then. Thanks everyone.