



Project Operations & Implementation Team
6/17/10 1:30 to 4:30 PM
Meeting Minutes

Team Members Present: David Menefee (DCW), Elaine Huffman (FAD), Carol Wahlgren (DCW), Sam Martinez (ACF), , Nancy McDaniel (MPCWIC), Anne Comstock (MPCWIC), Lloyd Malone (DCW), Judy Rodriguez (DCW), Julie Morales (MPCWIC), Julie McCrae (MPCWIC), Barbara Drake (Douglas County), Dawn Rivas (C&FT substitute for Art Atwell), Gayle Stack (ARD)

Team Members Absent: Art Atwell (C&FT), Dan Makelky (DCW), Van Head (OITS, Trails), Frank Alexander (Boulder DHS)

Guests: Glenn Lavezzi (Communications Work Group), Julie McCrea, (MPCWIC), Ki'i Powell (Performance Mgmt Work Group)

I. Welcome and Introductions

- Welcome of new member, Barbara Drake, Douglas County DHS.

II. Review and Approval of last meeting minutes - previous meeting minutes approved.

III. New Agenda Item: Charter review/approval.

- POIT has the authority to approve/disapprove the work products of the CPI Work Groups and to make recommendations to the EOC
- Question: Is CPI Work Group output being approved by Sub-PAC?
Answer: The CPI structure does not feed into Sub-PAC
- Charter has not been approved (new agenda item)
 - Reprint charter, remove "Draft", then get members to sign
 - EOCs role is to review and advise
 - POIT decisions aren't reviewed by EOC
 - There are decisions POIT isn't authorized to make – will be made by appropriate person
 - CWD wants to move toward collaborative decision making processes
 - Objection to language "silence implies agreement" in "Values and way of work", Section VI, paragraph "g."
 - Discussion: Phrase in charter says, "Silence may imply many things, not necessarily agreement". Does the group agree?
 - New wording suggested, "Members voice opinions, ideas and suggestions to reach decisions, unless additional time is needed."
 - Consensus – Charter will be modified by Anne C. to reflect this wording

IV. Updates on CPI

- General discussion regarding CPI structure
 - Each WG has objectives on the Objectives sheet
 - The WGs appear to overlap with each other and with ARD's responsibilities which will require a lot of resources
 - Discussion – Cross-over between WG's will require good coordination
 - Cross group meetings will be necessary
 - WGs may be expanded or combined, some are time limited
- Performance Management WG
 - Performance Management WG will define common outcomes desired throughout the state
 - In the process of forming – seven members (DCW)
 - First meeting scheduled for July 14 – will start work on a charter and their objectives
 - Handout – Member lists for existing Teams and WGs
 - Inform David M if any names are missing
- DCW internal work
 - Ongoing discussion about mission, vision
 - No deadline for process, it takes as long as it needs
- Communications WG
 - Getting out information about CPI to all DCW staff
 - Working on improving internal communications, using different modes including email, white-boards, newsletters
 - Documents currently being produced are for internal distribution only – won't be available outside the division until final versions are done
 - Working on Tool Kit draft to give to anyone involved in CPI on how to describe it
 - Includes template posters, flyers, FAQ, a Powerpoint introduction, and one-page description of CPI
 - Gathering requests from counties on “How to get counties involved”
 - Working on project timeline
 - Information needs to get out faster
 - Meeting next Wed, will need approvals from POIT sooner than late July
 - Email worked before
 - Will reply to Communications WG through David M, who will pass the decision on
 - If there is an issue, approval will be withheld until next POIT meeting, will be discussed at the next meeting
 - Reply will take about a week
 - Based on POIT approval, Glenn L will print two or three posters and submit for POIT approval
 - Program Operations and Implementation Team congratulates the Communications WG for their work
 - Preparing documents describing CPI to give to attendees at various events
 - Includes a one-page description of CPI as well as an FAQ
 - Communications WG is open to feedback – if there is a problem, open to discussion
 - Some of the wording on the draft hand-outs could be more forward thinking
 - Sample hand-outs for today are very rough drafts
 - All WG minutes, charters and membership lists will be on DCW website
 - When does new DCW website go live?

- Will be gradual, in stages
 - Complete revamp
- Will add a “get involved” hyperlink to a page on how to do so
- Karen Beye wants to minimize the number of newsletters going out from DHS. There are a number of them in DCW alone.
 - Will revamp the CFSR newsletter to include CPI rather than create a new one
 - New newsletter could include all of the three existing newsletters
 - Prospective names for the newsletter are being considered
 - Name for newsletter is not a POIT issue, should be decided by DCW
 - Some feel that POIT should have approval authority on the names
 - POIT prefers the name “WYNK” without the “The”

AI - David M will take POIT comments to Caitlin S

- EOC
 - Reviewed logo and other CPI information
 - Impressed with both progress and direction of work done so far
 - Will manage merging CPI and PIP
 - Discussion on how to merge
- Evaluation WG
 - Practice Model Survey, first deliverable for WG, went out Friday, 6/11
 - Developed and launched in less than a month
 - To date, 20 counties have forwarded the survey to staff
 - Survey timeline
 - Due in 7/2
 - Analysis from 7/5 to 7/19, possibly less
 - Should be ready before the Practice Model WG’s first meetings on 7/27-28
 - Information will be available to other WGs
 - Survey questions included a skills list for them to rate their counties and the state
 - County members of the WG helped reduce the complexity and time required to take the survey. For example, survey draft had open-ended questions, but decided to go with multiple choice to make the survey easier to take and less time consuming for county staff
 - Julie M, working with the New Mexico team, had an Evaluation WG meeting with them, and shared the CPI team’s experience with them. They requested a copy of the survey
 - Survey is public information – anyone can share it
 - POIT would like a copy of the survey
 - POIT would like to be informed of how many responses come in from each county
 - Communications WG is interested in survey results – can they be posted to the web? Yes
 - Question: Do we share drafts? Answer: No, they are not ready for public distribution
 - Need dates on all drafts to keep track of them
 - Working on their plan
 - Mapping activities in their work plan to project phases and objectives
 - Question: How to measure progress?
 - Meeting every two weeks
 - Will need some POIT approvals sooner than once per month - email process used before worked fine
- Practice Model WG

- Large and varied group – 32 members (membership closed)
- Will have meetings in June, July and September. June meetings are for orientation. Meetings in July to build the Practice Model framework
- Plan for gathering of statewide staff and stakeholder input in August (possibly via Town hall meetings)
- Work of group will conclude September 23, when they reconvene to consider the statewide input and make final recommendations for the practice model.
- Members will be invited to participate in the Implementation WG that will convene in the fall.
- Town hall meetings
 - A part of the practice model development design in broad-based staff and stakeholder input.
 - The challenge is the timing – has to be done in August
 - Suggested approach is to host Town Hall meetings across the state (2 in each of the six regions)
 - Question: Is the town hall meeting the right format to get this information?
 - Schedule to complete by late August is very aggressive
 - Plan for 45 min for presentation of CPI and practice model in the meeting format may not be enough time.
 - Question: What is the purpose of the town hall meetings?
 - The goal is to gather input, feedback and reaction to the practice model framework developed by the work group.
 - The meetings will explain the Practice Model, what the Practice Model WG is doing
 - Question: Who is it designed for?
 - Staff and stakeholder (included Judges, educators, etc.)
 - Discussion regarding the challenges of having heterogeneous groups of participants (county staff, consumers, stakeholders) and whether this is the best approach to achieve the goal?
 - Question: Do we want county staff to hear about CPI for the first time by asking them what they think about it in front of others?
 - Looking for a consensus building process – is this the best way to achieve that?
 - Town hall meetings will be at six locations – will people drive that far? No.
 - Might be better to use natural venues like HB 1451 IOGs
 - Would get representation from people across the entire state
 - Could ask HB1451 IOG people to get feedback from other local staff
 - 22 counties are involved in HB1451
 - CW conference in September might be a good venue
 - CPI is already on the agenda, but will be too late for gathering information for CPI
 - Statewide Child Protection Team meeting will be on August 16, 17, 18
 - More than 25 attendees, could invite more
 - Could help to launch the town hall meetings
 - Get the practitioners involved, and time to work on the Practice Model skeleton prior to implementation phase
 - Question: Are there other “natural” venues?
 - Most are at the supervisory level
 - Would like to get staff level input from all counties – probably not possible now
 - Originally thought that the Practice Model would be given to all county’s staff and to stakeholders for review
 - Phase 1 counties need to get up to speed on the Practice Model in August
 - Information can be distributed to counties sequentially – some counties will feel left behind

- Focus groups have worked well in the past to get county staff input
- Practice Model should be moved forward at peer level, not at the director level
- Question: How to involve families? Answer: Effort needs to become county lead
- HB1451 IOGs don't involve caseworkers – are administration level
- IOGs serve youth, not the entire population
- Creating Practice Model should be scheduled for six months, not one – some counties may be left behind resulting in potential implementation problems
- Could continue to develop the Practice Model while beginning implementation phase
- Use ARD, field staff and CW staff to go to counties, starting with the Big 11
- Could get input from 90% of county staff
- Explore natural venues more

AI – Lloyd M will discuss town hall strategy with Barbara D., Frank A. and Cheryl T.

Upcoming meeting between MPCWIC, CWLT and Gayle S. to discuss town hall meeting strategy

V. How PIP and other initiatives (DR, Family Engagement, CFSR) fit into the CPI

- Family involvement is a likely value for the Practice Model which is compatible with PIP
- Differential Response is a Family Engagement method, compatible with PIP
- These other programs will not appear in PIP as such, but PIP measures the appropriate outcomes
- Need clarity on curriculum
- Without proper coaching of caseworkers and staff, there will be no change in outcomes
- Train supervisors to coach staff
- Funding needed to change curriculum
 - Working with American Humane to bring curriculum up to date
 - Changes will be synchronized with PIP
 - Currently no administrative training offered

VI. Practice Model Implementation

- Start small with three to five counties, then add more
- ID criteria to help counties self-select for Phase 1
- Some counties have already begun to implement their own Practice Models
- Involve both counties who have started and those who haven't
- MPCWIC has a readiness survey for counties
- Similar done with Differential Response
- Leadership around practice is in the counties themselves
- Assess how counties who have no Practice Model adapt to having one
- Counties that are already implementing a Practice Model may not be implementing one at the same level as the Colorado Practice Model
 - Readiness survey will determine if that is true
 - Some counties can't devote the necessary time
 - Phase 1 counties need to have a full understanding of the Practice Model
 - Need mix of counties
 - Metro and rural
 - Some implementing Practice Models, some not

- Doing well and struggling
- POIT members should scout for potential Phase 1 counties
- How are the courts involved?
- Judges need to be involved, but not for the first time at town hall meetings
-

VII. CW Leadership conference

AI – Lloyd M. will determine what the focus is by next meeting

Next Meeting – July 15th, 1:30 pm, 6th Floor Conference Room

Meeting adjourned at 4:30

Minutes submitted by:
Dave Bellamy