

Tobacco Use Prevention Data and Evaluation Workgroup Meeting 2 Evaluation Results

September 5, 2007

		ites as a workgr		e thus far, I have an			3
-	<u>-</u>	•	-	Ctronet - Die	N1/A	Discili	Δ
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Blank	Averag
24% (4)	71% (12)	0% (0)	6% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	(0)	4.12
1 b <i>The goal</i>	s of the project	•					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Blank	Averag
29% (5)	53% (9)	18% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	(0)	4.12
1 c Similar e	valuation effor	ts in other state	s				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	<i>Disagree</i>	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Blank	Averag
18% (3)	76% (13)	6% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	(0)	4.12
. ,	. ,	. ,	070(0)	070(0)	070 (0)	(0)	
	sas Tobacco Qı						
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Blank	Averag
41% (7)	53% (9)	6% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	(0)	4.35
l e <i>CDC's To</i>	obacco Prevent	ion Evaluation l	Process				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Blank	Averag
29% (5)	59% (10)	12% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	(0)	4.18
l f Goal Are	a Logic Models						
Strongly Agree	Agree	, Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Blank	Averac
24% (4)	47% (8)	29% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	(0)	3.94
	. ,		0 70 (0)	070(0)	070 (0)	(0)	0.04
l g <i>Goal Are</i>	a Outcomes an	d Indicators					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Blank	Averag
31% (5)	69% (11)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	(1)	4.31
l h <i>Small gr</i>	oup tasks						
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Blank	Averag
29% (5)	65% (11)	0% (0)	6% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	(0)	4.18
i The Wor	kgroup's next s	tone					
	-	=	Diogramos	Ctrongly Diogram	N/A	Dlank	A
Strongly Agree 21% (3)	<i>Agree</i> 50% (7)	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	0% (0)	Blank (1)	Averag 3.93
21% (3)	50% (7)	29% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	(1)	3.93
l j <i>Commer</i> articipation a	nd Outcomes						
a There ha	s been adequa	te time for getti	ng to know ead	h other and building	a functional v	vorkgroup.	
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Blank	Averag
24% (4)	29% (5)	24% (4)	24% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	(0)	3.53
b lam sufi	iciently aware	of the knowledg	and evnertis	e the other workgroup	n mamhars hr	ing to the n	00000
	-	_	=			-	
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Blank (0)	Averag
4007 (0)	35% (6)	35% (6)	12% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	(0)	3.59
18% (3)	as adequate tim	e for questions	, answers, and	discussion.			
. ,	is adequate tim.		Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Blank	Averag
2 c There wa	Agree	Neutral			007 (0)	(0)	3.29
2 c There wa	-	<i>Neutral</i> 59% (10)	12% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	(0)	0.20
2 c There was Strongly Agree 12% (2)	Agree 18% (3)	59% (10)	12% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	(0)	0.20
2 c There was Strongly Agree 12% (2) 2 d The grou	Agree 18% (3) up made sufficie	59% (10) ent progress at	12% (2)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
2 c There was Strongly Agree 12% (2) 2 d The grou Strongly Agree	Agree 18% (3) up made sufficie Agree	59% (10) ent progress at Neutral	12% (2) this meeting. Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Blank	Averaç
2 c There was Strongly Agree 12% (2) 2 d The grou	Agree 18% (3) up made sufficie	59% (10) ent progress at	12% (2)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
2 c There was Strongly Agree 12% (2) 2 d The grou Strongly Agree 24% (4)	Agree 18% (3) Ip made sufficie Agree 47% (8)	59% (10) ent progress at Neutral	12% (2) this meeting. Disagree 18% (3)	Strongly Disagree 0% (0)	N/A	Blank	Averaç
2 c There was Strongly Agree 12% (2) 2 d The grou Strongly Agree 24% (4)	Agree 18% (3) Ip made sufficie Agree 47% (8)	59% (10) ent progress at Neutral 12% (2)	12% (2) this meeting. Disagree 18% (3)	Strongly Disagree 0% (0)	N/A	Blank	Averag

Meeting 2 Evaluation Resuls Page 1

2 f I believe the evaluation plan taking shape is one that will be used by multiple partners for long-term tracking and process improvement.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Blank	Average
35% (6)	35% (6)	24% (4)	6% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	(0)	4.00

2 g Comments

3 What part(s) of today's meeting did you find most valuable? Why?

Working with outcomes and indicators.

Learned things I did not know. Love learning.

Powerpoint presentations and group tasks.

Small group work - very educational.

Learned of other data sources.

Group discussion.

Discussion.

Small groups.

Small group discussion.

Discussion of short term objectives - helped focus. Kim Kimminau's discussion of what other states are attempting - put Kansas in context.

Information on other states, KAN-STOP, and group work.

4 What part(s) of today's meeting did you find to be the least valuable? Why?

None really.

All good.

None.

Presentation about other state's plans. Not detailed enough to gauge relevance to our work.

Discussion would have benefited from facilitators.

Too short.

Not enough time to develop or plan in the time being provided.

None

Difficult when so many people left - their expertise would have been very helpful.

What recommendations do you have as we finalize Meeting 3 plans?

Maybe an approach is to go through the outcomes only, then focus on indicators. It was hard to complete outcomes and then go after indicators.

Will not be able to attend third meeting.

Flip charts not used/needed.

None.

More time for discussion.

Make sure next steps are communicated.

I will not be in attendance.

I hope we can get input from others.

6 Are there any other comments or suggestions you would like to share?

State of Kansas EAP gives state employees option of Quitline or the cessation model suggested by the outsource contract. Information online for state employee, if more information needed.

Notebook sections should have been tabulated for quick access to sections. Housekeeping: Ask people to police their personal areas before leaving.

Would be easier if lunch was provided - to have working lunch.

No (other comments or suggestions). Thanks for the opportunity to be a part of this process.

Meeting 2 Evaluation Resuls Page 2