

# CFSR PIP Pilot: End of PIP Feedback Survey



*THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13) Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 5 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and reviewing the collection of information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The control number for this project is 0970-0401. The control number expires on 5/31/2021.*

The Capacity Building Collaborative is conducting an evaluation of the Round 3 Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) Program Improvement Plan (PIP) Pilots. Please provide feedback about your experiences across all aspects of the PIP Pilot. This feedback will be used to inform PIP process improvements. All information you provide is voluntary and anonymous. The survey should take about 5 minutes to complete. If you have any questions, please contact Christine Leicht, Capacity Building Center for States Evaluation Lead at [Christine.Leicht@icf.com](mailto:Christine.Leicht@icf.com).

1. Which of the following best describes your agency role? (Select One)
  - a. Public Agency Director/Deputy Director
  - b. Public Agency Program/Middle Manager
  - c. Public Agency Supervisor
  - d. Public Agency Caseworker/Direct Practice Worker/Frontline staff
  - e. Family/Youth Partner
  - f. Legal/Court Partner
  - g. Private Agency Partner
  - h. Federal Partner
  - i. TA Provider
  - j. Other (Please Specify)

Please rate your agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
2. I feel like the PIP Pilot process has been valuable.					
3. There was good representation of key stakeholders from <u>inside</u> state agency during the PIP development process overall.					

4. There was good representation of key stakeholders from <u>outside</u> the state agency during the PIP development process overall.					
5. Participants in the PIP development process effectively partnered with one another <i>after</i> the onsite meeting.					
6. I felt that participants in the PIP development process were committed to working together.					
7. My understanding of the key underlying issues/root causes changed significantly <i>after</i> the onsite meeting.  If you agree, what changed?					
8. I feel confident that we identified the key underlying issues/root causes for the state's performance during this process.					
9. The theory of change developed during this pilot process accurately presents the state agency and its stakeholders' shared assumptions about how the state will improve its outcomes.					
10. The logic model(s) developed during this pilot process clearly links specific strategies with measurable outputs, short- and long-term outcomes (including performance on the CFSR).					
11. The PIP strategies that have been submitted for CB approval are the same as those chosen during the onsite meeting.  If you disagree, what changed?					
12. The strategies included in the final PIP will directly address the underlying issues/root causes of the state's performance.					
13. The state can realistically expect to be able to implement the final PIP strategies.					
14. The technical assistance provided <i>after</i> the onsite meeting was helpful.					

15. A higher quality PIP was developed because of the work accomplished during the pre-onsite and onsite meetings.					
--	--	--	--	--	--

16. What suggestions do you have for improving the PIP process?