

**Research and Evaluation Committee Meeting
Minutes
6/4/15 1PM**

Attendance

	Present	Absent
<u>VOTING MEMBERS</u>		
Jennifer Funderburk	X	
Jennifer Hodgson	X	
Jeff Goodie	X	
Jodi Polaha	X	
Jennifer Wray		X
Zephon Lister	X	
<u>NON VOTING MEMBERS</u>		
Rusty Kallenberg	X	
Astrid Beigel	X	
Ian Bennett		
Bill McFeature		
Tom Bishop	X	
Brian DeSantis	X	
C R Macchi		
Christine Runyan		
Chris Hunter	X	
Colleen Cordes		
Danielle King		
David Johnson	X	
Emma Gilchrist		
Gary		
Jeri Turgesen		
Jessica Pittrizzi		
Karen Kinman		
Polly Kurtz	X	
Lesley Mason		
Katilin Lilenthal		
Lori Zeman		
Mark Vogel		
Mary Peterson		
Mary Talen		
Matthew Tolliver		
Tawnya Meadows		
Miyoung Yoon Hammer		
Beth Nolan		
Patrick Palmieri		
Randi Dublin		
Robyn Shepardson		
Stacy Ogbeide		
Christina Studts		
Suzanne Daub		
Will Lusenhop		
Kathryn Woods		
Rodger Kessler		
Joe Grasso		
Nyann Biery		

Kaitlin Lilienthal	X	
--------------------	---	--

1. Approval of Minutes from 5/7/15.

Move to approve: move to approve __Jen H_____; seconded by __Jeff __G_____

1. Fellowship application update

- a. We had 10 applications
- b. Discussed the review process with 3 reviewers rating each application
 - i. Decided to stay the course with current review process as it is a manageable number and gives valuable feedback to the applicants
- c. Marketing to increase the number of applications next year?
 - i. Jeff G: Is there same mentors?
 - 1. Polly: Some of the same mentors and some are different and new
 - ii. Decided that after review process and prior to the next fellowship call we would see what we could do to increase applications
- d. Review would occur in July, compilation of ratings for August meeting

2. Research Track

- a. Reviewed the 5 abstracts chosen (4 either lead or co-authored by members of the research committee)
 - i. Due to the fact that many of the abstracts did not include the necessary information to evaluate it for the track, we need to remember to evaluate call for research track after conference
 - ii. Jodi: Jen and I worked hard to attempt to bring more new people to CFHA, need to remember it was difficult to bring outside implementation scientists and consider ways CFHA can do this in the future
- b. Evaluation of the track to see if we want to do this again in the future
 - i. All committee members indicated a need to evaluate the track
 - ii. Decided to create a subcommittee (Jen H, Zephon, Jeff, and anyone else who is willing to volunteer) to discuss it and identify best processes and questions that we would want to add, then compare it with the existing survey given by CFHA to all participants following each presentation---present at July meeting
 - 1. Discussion:
 - a. Online feedback, Jen F offered the use of psychdata.com, either ask them to go to the site after the presentation or obtain all participants emails and email them afterwards; consider obtaining feedback 3-4 weeks after conference to allow for the ability to ask about whether they have any plans to use the information
 - b. No prohibition to a paper questionnaire, Jodi offered student help to enter the data, but may be difficult as CFHA already asks participants to complete a paper survey
 - c. Presenters could have a required slide to help participants know about the evaluation and its importance

- d. Conduct a telephone survey on a small number of participants (Jodi offered student helpers) to collect indepth qualitative data.
 - e. Possible Types of questions: learn something new?, did they have specific plans to use data that they learned;
 - c. **Publishing papers that appear in research track in special issue in Family Systems & health–**
 - i. Need to develop a proposal and identify editors to make this happen
 - ii. Jodi and Jen F (Jeff is interested but depends on timeline) offered to be an editor, is anyone else interested?
 - iii. Discussion
 - 1. Dedicated to an update on the newest and best methods for evaluating implementation
 - 2. Overview article---short didactic on need for doing the research we all need to learn to do
 - 3. Articles provide examples
 - 4. Market research track to larger audience for future conferences
 - iv. Outcome: Recruit other volunteers, Jen/Jodi will draft a proposal for July/Aug meeting to have committee review prior to giving to FSH editors
- 3. **Any ideas from the group on how we should use our time for the CFHA monthly webinar we are slated for (Sept/Oct)?**
 - a. Teaser for our track was the original plan, do we still want to do? Brought up next item
- 4. **Market our research track—Jen H, Jodi, Jen F,**
 - a. Created a subcommittee (Jen H, Jodi, Jen F, and other volunteers) to identify ways we can market the research track in Portland and present to committee in July
 - i. Ideas mentioned:
 - 1. Incentive for individuals to participate within the track
 - 2. Early Professors/Students---to go through the whole track—target that population to actively participate
 - 3. Local area surrounding Portland—universities or medical centers
- 5. **Next Meeting is day before National Holiday**---send out a poll for committee indicating which dates they can make it: 7/2/15 at 1pm or 7/9/15 at 1pm EST. End poll in 1 week and majority rules (make sure to make it so can choose both)
- 6. **Discuss at July Meeting: CFHA abstracts/reviewer process**
 - a. Plan for giving feedback to CFHA based on our conversation at last meeting?