

Colorado Practice Initiative – Research and Evaluation Workgroup
April 22, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Attendance: Van Head (IT), David Menefee (CW), Anne Comstock (MPCWIC), Michael Gallegos (CW), Ki'i Powell (CW), David Bellamy (CW), Julie Morales (MPCWIC), Anna de Guzman (MPCWIC)

- I. Upcoming cross-site evaluation activities
 - The first activity will be Director interviews so Lloyd will be receiving an email heads-up soon that the interview will be conducted, by telephone, in June
 - Questions will be asked regarding TA that Colorado has received from MPCWIC team
 - For any future activities, Julie will let the group know

- II. Research and Evaluation Workgroup Charter
 - Idea for this charter came from Anne, with the idea to help us clarify the purpose, roles, terms, etc. for the team
 - Group was given 10 minutes to review the Charter and to jot down thoughts. Group discussion afterwards will focus on items 3 and 4.
 - Group Discussion: Leadership, roles and functions
 - Provide expertise
 - Carry a single voice, single message
 - First need to determine the memberships; who are members representing and based upon that, determine roles in the group, thus solidifying what membership is
 - May have some “homework” to do with expectations of doing them between meetings
 - Re: representation from counties, Julie is attending a meeting on Friday and she will bring up the Research and Evaluation Workgroup to them and asking for volunteers (with the understanding that those interested will need to go back to their directors to get permission)
 - Criteria for volunteering – real experience with TRAILS and experience/expertise with managing it/using it for monitoring, what they've done for their counties
 - As far as membership and term – helps to clarify everyone's roles and for everyone to understand that membership is long term
 - Group Discussion: Boundaries, limitations, authority and accountability
 - Need to set up target dates, especially as we develop the evaluation plan
 - Need to set up appropriate procedure/process for going to the counties
 - What is that going to look like? At the very least, bringing it up to POIT group and letting them know what we're doing
 - Communication group? Are they going to help do that?
 - David M. has brought copies of CPI's 12 work plan objectives; page 3 is a reworked conceptual model; the last pages have examples of an objective and the steps being taken to meet that objective; last page is David's write up of plan steps of Obj. 9 (the group's objective – Evaluate Child Welfare Outcomes of the CPI); at some point, the workgroup should look at this and write up our own project steps
 - David's handout fits right into creating an actual evaluation plan and an evaluation logic model. Group agrees that they're not needed right now, but as the practice model starts to take shape, then the group can start working on the evaluation plan and logic model, and looking at what outcomes we expect. What the group needs to focus on the internal

strategic planning because that's happening right now. Group should have a fully articulated evaluation plan by beginning of July.

- For evaluation, there is going to be some kind of process measure that members of each CPI work group will complete. Our task is to determine what the important outcomes are for each work group. We are going to look at what are the drivers that are specific to each work group. It will be important to remember that our evaluation plan will change as each work group adjusts their own plans as they need to.
 - In terms of specifically evaluating the practice model, the group will need to set up evaluative criteria and processes for informing the county child welfare offices of their performance on an ongoing basis. QA will be working very closely with what are those outcome measures for children and families and how do we communicate those outcomes to children and families and to CW services in routine way.
 - When it comes time to evaluating the practice model, Michael's work group will be working closely with evaluation group. There will need to be alignment between CDHS' QA and Research and Evaluation teams.
 - Because of people's memberships into several work groups, multiple work groups are being represented within each one. Understood that most work groups are going to have to interact with each other at some point. For example, if a task of the Research and Evaluation Work Group included communicating to all CW directors in counties, we would have to work collaboratively with Communication group, but what is their role? Communication group is more like a consulting group, not their role to take what other groups have and go and communicate it but they would have methodology and protocols in place for what we are looking to do.
 - There will be a lot of overlap because of having memberships into multiple work groups. It may work for some things, not for others.
- Anna will collect all handouts and compile responses for next meeting. Charter template will be emailed to group members who were not present with the request that they email their responses to Anna.

III. Discussion of results from the Evaluation Capacity Self-Assessment

- Responses show strong evaluation skills both individually and operationally.
- Weakest skill is in preparing IRB protocols, again individually and operationally.

IV. Continued work on Stages by Drivers Grid

- Continued discussion of what would be an indicator of success of that activity; some of this is being discussed in the relevant groups. See highlighted sections.
- Selection Stage: Selection of leaders/staff to conduct PM visioning
 - Practice Model Design and Development Group – will put together a skeleton model and they will go out to the counties to get feedback
 - Members will be ARD, county people (maybe half), 6 CW people, field admin, court improvement, Art Atwell, 2 consumers, and DIFRAC
 - Re: selection process, Lloyd has contacted all of the county people and is asking them to name someone from county to be in workgroup. Also making contact with ARD field and reaching out to relevant groups. So far, stumped on consumer piece because it's a big commitment to ask them, but Anne is getting contacts from people she's asked.
 - Question was asked if there will be youth representation. Challenge with membership to PMDD is that it needs to be balanced but not so big that the group cannot make decisions. Right now membership is going to be about 20 people. Youth have to be on the table,

whether in that group or in another function, as an addition to having adult consumers. Anne will reach out to Ricardo about the Youth Leadership Team.

- Training Stage: Developing goal statement & using it for messaging/marketing for PM visioning
 - PMDD group will work out what is the message that is going to out to the counties
 - This task and the selection task above will be part of the process of the PMDD group
 - Question: are we talking about the skeleton model or the actual practice model? For the long term, messaging and marketing will be the role of Communication Group. PMDD is going to create a level of excitement around PM; a parallel process because Communication Group is going to introduce the PM and get out to counties.
- Facilitative Administration Stage: Selection of staff to conduct policy & procedure assessments
 - If there are some P&P work, work group from Objective 10 will be the ones who are going to make those identifications
 - P&P work group – very difficult to know when and how they will be in play. Not sure if they need to be convened pre-PM development or not until after.
- To be continued!

V. New items: Surveying counties and upcoming meeting dates

- Survey the counties
 - David M. introduced his idea of surveying the counties to ask county staff what they currently see is their practice model; what does it look like, what are its components. We would get info back from the counties and use that, CSFRs and the literature around PMs to integrate with PMDD as they develop the skeleton model.
 - MPCWIC can support this piece by using DU's online survey program, Qualtrics.
 - Group agrees that this is something that we would like to develop; it fits with what we're doing. However, the turnaround time is very quick because survey results must be ready for PMDD group when they meet the first week of July.
 - **Julie will email a set of sample questions by April 29 and homework is for everyone to respond to that document.** If you have ideas, get them to Julie!
 - How will we get emails to distribute the survey?
 - There are listservs with TRAILS, and Caitlyn has some too
 - Ki'i will take responsibility for creating an email list. List will be ready by May 20.
 - Regarding consumer input, a lot of group discussion about whether parents should be involved in this process and how. If we're talking about including family engagement and including that in the practice model, then we need to involve them from the beginning. Ki'i will look into state family advocacy groups.
 - Communication is meeting on Monday; can ask them what they need from us for this survey. Also, get help on some kind of branding?
 - Survey will need to be finalized at our next meeting, May 20 so that it can be sent out to email list the following week. Survey will be open for 3 – 4 weeks to provide enough time to analyze and give results given to PMDD group.
- Group agreement to meet more often as we work on the initial county survey and developing an evaluation plan/logic model.
 - **Upcoming Meeting Dates; all times are 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm**
 - May 20, 2010 (new date because regular May 27th meeting date is cancelled)**
 - June 3, 2010**
 - June 24, 2010**
 - Meeting dates for July will be discussed later because PMDD group will be meeting often that month.

- **Group members agree to pick a backup person to attend meetings when unable to attend in person.**
- David B. will put together a master calendar for all CPI work groups' meeting dates. It will be on Google Calendar so everyone will have access.