

**Evaluation Board Agenda**  
**Date: 12/16/08**  
**Location: BSU Child Welfare Center**  
**Conference Call #: 1-888-751-0624; Participant #: 604110**



***Partnership Goals:***

- #1** ~ Improve retention of Workforce and Resource Families
- #2** ~ Improve Recruitment of Workforce and Resource Families
- #3** ~ Decrease Disparate Outcomes in Child Welfare

**Attendance:** Brian Baldwin, Chuck Halligan, Butch Rodenhiser, Mardell Nelson, Alberta Dooley, Oscar Morgan, Rick Phillips, Lawanna Lancaster (Guest), Robert Hernandez (Notes)

AGENDA ITEM	TIME	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
<b>Welcome, Minutes Review</b>	1:00	<p>The November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2008 minutes were reviewed.</p> <p><b><u>Proposal for Evaluation</u></b>  <b>Race Research Project.</b> Lawanna Lancaster gave an update to the board on her research project and indicated that her advisor has given basic approval to her doctorate proposal. She brought and shared what she plans to do. It will be looking at whether or not race is a factor in a child being removed and will look at how the relationship gets built in the first 30 days that form a case's foundation. This has fourteen variables between the worker and the family.</p> <p><b>Project Research Locations.</b> Another piece will look at Regions 3, 4, 5, and 6 since there is high disproportionality with Hispanic and Native Americans there. The goal would be to look more at a descriptive relationship and the variety of factors that have disproportionality as well as what are the differences and factors influencing disproportionality. The project will also look at the Shoshone Bannock Tribe and Duck Valley. The biggest challenge will be working with families and case work on a micro level since the time is limited. She is hoping for one hundred fifty families from March 1 through April 30<sup>th</sup> and wants 100 percent within this timeframe. It was asked how the Indian Child Welfare Act impacts this. The tribes have a system where they put Native American children</p>		

Purpose: To facilitate outcome identification, development and achievement, provide guidance and support for the implementation of service and outcome evaluation activities associated with the Partnership, and to promote and develop standardization of procedures.

Evaluation Board Agenda

Date: 12/16/08

Location: BSU Child Welfare Center

Conference Call #: 1-888-751-0624; Participant #: 604110

		<p>in their own system. She can look at the number of Native American children who come into the system.</p> <p><b>Project Managers' Contact.</b> Lawanna has not spoken with the managers yet. The managers will meet in February but have a monthly call. It was suggested to contact them right away and have a one page synopsis for them to review. It would be good to speak with Program Managers individually to inform them and then have a group meeting. It was recommended to start with Frances Lunney.</p> <p><b>Project Interviewing Considerations.</b> Lawanna plans to interview right after this gets transferred to a case manager. This could be difficult since there still may be kids in care. This may be the worse time to speak with families since they are more emotional toward DHW. When will DHW accept her interviewing the families? There are a lot of issues with the family and the risk assessor since this is seen as taking children away. This is true in any race. If this goes to court, families are told by defense attorneys not to speak to anyone. It was not believed that this will get past the managers with the time frame Lawanna set. She can ask, but may not be likely. Lawanna plans to do this after the adjudicatory hearing, which would be around sixty days. It was brought up that she may have to sign a confidentiality agreement. The concern is that participants may feel leveraged (coerced) when being interviewed. If DHW contacts them, they may feel that way. As long as DHW has the children and a decision has not been made, they would feel obligated to participate. The parent's attorney would scrutinize what they do, so Lawanna needs to show that she is separate from DHW. It would be good to let the participants, through the attorney, be aware of the potential of engaging in a research study and have permission to have her call them.</p> <p><b>Project Interview Incentives.</b> Lawanna asked for suggestions for incentives. The incentive cannot be coercive. Vouchers for food or gasoline and they can chose from a menu (\$30 for parent) was one way it was done and worked well. This is justification to the IRB that they are being paid for their</p>		<p>Lawanna will contact Program Managers beginning with Frances Lunney.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Purpose: To facilitate outcome identification, development and achievement, provide guidance and support for the implementation of service and outcome evaluation activities associated with the Partnership, and to promote and develop standardization of procedures.

**Evaluation Board Agenda**

**Date: 12/16/08**

**Location: BSU Child Welfare Center**

**Conference Call #: 1-888-751-0624; Participant #: 604110**

		<p>time. The interview time will likely be mid May and latest time is August. She would get 100-110 of the new entries.</p> <p><b>Project Methodology.</b> It was brought up that this is a mixed methodology- database and interview process. Think about possible outcomes of adjudicatory families and look for different outcome areas with a single case study. If broken down by outcome, then she will have to be selective.</p> <p><b>Project Next Steps.</b> Contact Frances. Brian will speak with Frank for the Program Managers while Lawanna works on one on one. The Program Managers meet on February 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup>, 2009.</p> <p><b>Project IRB.</b> Lawanna will provide a copy of the University of Texas IRB to DHW so DHW can see if it needs to add anything to it.</p>		<p>Brian will speak with Frank for the Program Managers on Lawanna's research.</p>
<p><b>Work on Charter</b></p>		<p><b>Charter Progress Report.</b> After the charter update is completed, the old documents will be archived. At lot of energy has gone toward maintaining current conditions due to the budget cuts so there has not been a lot of progress in some of the recently assigned tasks.</p> <p><b>Partnership Mission.</b> It was brought up that after uncovering areas of disagreement, the Partnership's purpose grew. The real issue is- what is the mission of the Partnership? Is the mission broad or narrow, with the broader purpose being child welfare in Idaho or the narrow focus of service to DHW? If the mission is broader, then it can be more inclusive; if it is too narrow, then this narrows the possibilities of what can be accomplished. The Admin Board has to resolve this before any other board can decide where they go. So it would be good to hold off on this until the mission is decided.</p> <p><b>Admin Board Meeting.</b> The recent Admin Board meeting started the conversation on the Partnership's larger/smaller scope view. Michelle had boundaries around the boards under contracts except for the Evaluation Board. The next step in the meeting was to put structure to the honest conversation that was taking place, but there was no energy to do this. There will</p>	<p>It was decided</p>	

Purpose: To facilitate outcome identification, development and achievement, provide guidance and support for the implementation of service and outcome evaluation activities associated with the Partnership, and to promote and develop standardization of procedures.

**Evaluation Board Agenda**

**Date: 12/16/08**

**Location: BSU Child Welfare Center**

**Conference Call #: 1-888-751-0624; Participant #: 604110**

		<p>be a meeting on where the Partnership can go, especially in light of the budget cuts and its effects on the Partnership.</p> <p><b>Evaluation Board Lead.</b> It has been seen that the boards have broader purpose than what the contracts spell out; the contracts have more to do with the Centers. The Evaluation Board can lead on this since the Admin Board consensus is that this board is broader. The Partnership is about improving practice and outcomes in Idaho. So when work is done on the Evaluation Board's Charter, it should speak on improving outcomes.</p> <p><b>Charter Decision.</b> It was decided to keep the charter workgroup intact, wait for the Admin Board to meet, and develop a proposal for the Admin Board to discuss. The workgroup will keep this moving.</p>	<p>to keep the charter workgroup intact, wait for the Admin Board to meet, and develop a proposal for the Admin Board to discuss. The workgroup will keep this moving.</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Participatory Evaluation</b></p>		<p><b>Participatory Evaluation.</b> The Participatory Evaluation document was shared with the Operations Board and the FFIs and both were receptive to the document. Butch is looking for research themes. This was a key conversation at the Admin Board meeting, but has not been completely resolved. Put simply, they don't want to lose the university in research and the broader scope of involving faculty for outcomes. This fits in with the conversation of what the scope of the Partnership is. If it is seen as a larger public policy, then this opens up the ability for grant writing and evaluation. It would also allow a focus on outcomes for children and things outside the contracts.</p> <p><b>Faculty Research.</b> The faculty at BSU is doing research that could be connected with DHW. Ways to get word to the faculty to engage the system could be: 1.) a statement about the Evaluation Board; and 2.) the Admin Board share how they see participatory research. It is uncertain how this would evolve.</p> <p><b>Funding Suggestion.</b> At the Don Schmid IV-E consultation, Don spoke on barriers to grant writing. He suggested that the contracts be written with enough non-federal funds so that grants can be written. It would be great for the Evaluation Board to seek grants with an evaluation component. If this is shown as a statewide Partnership then it can draw down more funding and grants.</p>		

Purpose: To facilitate outcome identification, development and achievement, provide guidance and support for the implementation of service and outcome evaluation activities associated with the Partnership, and to promote and develop standardization of procedures.

Evaluation Board Agenda

Date: 12/16/08

Location: BSU Child Welfare Center

Conference Call #: 1-888-751-0624; Participant #: 604110

<p>CW Conference Focus Group Data</p>		<p><b>Program Managers' Response.</b> The Focus Group data was shared with the Program Managers and their conversation was to move forward with having the Evaluation Board more engaged in this process to make sure it is as useful as possible for the Program Managers. The Program Managers appreciated that a student was making the presentation, but they wanted raw data- details about what the workers are saying on what would make a difference, not just categories. The Program Managers should be given what they want.</p> <p><b>Boards' Response.</b> The board still needs to think about how to develop a process for understanding in order to interpret the data so that it has an impact on the audiences it is suppose impact; have an end product with the audience in mind. There also needs to be more standardized training to collect the data. Several boards are in the middle of their logic models and need the data for their next steps. There is a need to get this data in a usable form. The data should be produced in a helpful way around the goals and presented to the boards to use with their logic model. They can analyze the data that is helpful for them.</p> <p><b>Michelle's Response.</b> Michelle wanted a headline news story on the results, but there is hesitation on what to say in the headline. A headline news story can be- the data has been collected and here are some efforts being made... Brian needs to clarify with Michelle what she wants.</p> <p><b>Andrew's Response.</b> Andrew will continue to go forward with what he is doing. He can facilitate the process with the boards. It was in agreement that Andrew has his goal and the board does not want to interrupt it, but use his work for insights. It was decided to have, as agenda item at the next Evaluation Board meeting, interpretation of the data and follow up on Andrew's work. The Evaluation Board can form an interpretation on Andrew's work and the raw data. Brian will work with Andrew and Kathy to monitor their progress. Rick took one of the questions from retention and set the goal of presenting data coherently on one page. This was passed around and Rick did a walk through. This has been shared with Andrew and Kathy.</p>	<p>Have as agenda item at the next Evaluation Board meeting to interpret the focus data and follow up on Andrew's work.</p>	<p>Brian needs to clarify with Michelle what she wants for the focus data headline news.</p> <p>Brian will work with Andrew and Kathy to monitor their progress with the data.</p>
---	--	--	---	--

Purpose: To facilitate outcome identification, development and achievement, provide guidance and support for the implementation of service and outcome evaluation activities associated with the Partnership, and to promote and develop standardization of procedures.

**Evaluation Board Agenda**

**Date: 12/16/08**

**Location: BSU Child Welfare Center**

**Conference Call #: 1-888-751-0624; Participant #: 604110**

		<p>It was suggested to have a field manager on the board and this person can be a voice on the Evaluation Board.</p>		
<p><b>Data Sharing Workgroup</b></p>		<p><b>Data Sharing Group.</b> The data sharing group met last week, looked at where they left off and reviewed their documents. Sandy Cobb indicated that she has worked with EWU's IT Department and they will assign interns and developer to get the shared database up by June 2009. Sandy has each partnering agency's policy on security. The ICWRTC needs an updated list of resource families, which is being worked on. Some of the benefits of this would be to have shared database for stipends, more real time tracking, reports and online presentations. This can be archived in the Partnership website.</p> <p><b>Contracts.</b> The Contracts Unit is redoing contracts so that they have a general scope; that the contracts be more of a living document posted on a shared site that each university can view and not have to redo amendments. This would be an easier process and more centralized.</p> <p><b>Break.</b> During the meeting break, the BSU CWC staff presented Mardell with a retirement gift and wishes.</p>		
<p><b>FGDM Update</b></p>		<p><b>FGDM Data.</b> Ed has all of the data. Jeri sent him what he needs and he is working on it. His last report was received couple of weeks ago. This will be on next agenda. Michelle had FGDM at the top of the list at the Program Managers' meeting so this project is timely since contractors for this are changing. With the data showing that this is a good program, it will help with project's survival.</p> <p><b>FGDM Update</b> Ed had a mix-up with the time that he was supposed to call in and give his report. He contacted Brian later and gave him an update. Here is what was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ed has all the data and will have a report by the middle or end of January 2009.</li> <li>• Family Profile- how many prior CP referrals, what happened prior to FGDM and time lapse</li> <li>• Looking at the severity of the allegations proceeding FGDM involvement</li> </ul>		

Purpose: To facilitate outcome identification, development and achievement, provide guidance and support for the implementation of service and outcome evaluation activities associated with the Partnership, and to promote and develop standardization of procedures.

Evaluation Board Agenda

Date: 12/16/08

Location: BSU Child Welfare Center

Conference Call #: 1-888-751-0624; Participant #: 604110

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Following what happened within one year of FGDM, subsequent referrals, placements, reunification, etc.</li><li>• Next step- set up data warehouse to read a local file. This could be programmed to have a list on the hard drive- Tom Wheelan an extra month or so of data work is available</li><li>• May put together the brief data that was collected from the contractor files</li><li>• Concerns include that only 50% of the cases are developing a long-term plan</li></ul>		
<b>Adjourn</b>	4:00	The next meeting is tentatively set for the end of January 2009. Brian will poll the board for the best time.		

Purpose: To facilitate outcome identification, development and achievement, provide guidance and support for the implementation of service and outcome evaluation activities associated with the Partnership, and to promote and develop standardization of procedures.