

Evaluation Board Agenda  
June 16, 2008  
1:00 – 4:30  
Boise State Child Welfare Center

Teleconference Call-In Number:  
1-888-751-0624 ; Participant #: 604110



*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.*

**Partnership Goals:**

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

Those Present: Brian Baldwin, Alberta Dooley, Chuck Halligan, Mike Scholl, Oscar Morgan, Mardell Nelson, Roxanne Printz, Roy Rodenhiser, Frank Sesek, Kathy Tidwell

Guests: Rick Phillips, Heather Slavin-Taylor, Dawn Doepke, Paul Spannkebel, Lawanna Lancaster, Robert Hernandez (Notes)

Agenda Item	Beginning Time	Guests	Action Items/Action Takers
Announcements, Agenda Review, Begin Work	1:00		The Action Plan, Official Process Map, Matrix, and Framework were handed out with the following results.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Action Plan completed challenges were listed in gray and now a decision needed to be made as to what direction to take next.</li><li>• The revised addition to the Framework now included the Program Manager Signature. The chiefs were supportive of the Framework.</li><li>• Kathy received feedback on Evaluation Project and is going over this with the professor.</li><li>• It was suggested of the need for bullet points or something that summarizes the intention and philosophy of the Framework.</li></ul> <p>The next step is an outline explaining the Participatory Management Theory (the adopted COI), and embed the conversation into the PIP.</p> <p>It was agreed that Rick will craft the document before July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2008 to present to the Admin Board and set up exercises with the chiefs on August 7<sup>th</sup>, 2008 and also the program managers to get their input as his schedule permits.</p> <p>It was suggested to have a participatory meeting with the chiefs to apply the Region Improvement Plans and have them thinking in that direction.</p> <p>Mike, Michelle, and Mardell will meet for the agenda so that prior to the July Board they will have the talking points ready to present to Michelle and the Admin Board so the direction will be known on this.</p> <p>Rick will work on an overview of what Participatory Evaluation is. This can be for July Admin Board and August chiefs meeting to help coincide with R.I.P.S.</p> <p>Shirley announced that the report may be late so may have to delay.</p> <p>It was suggested to make sure that the whole system knows what</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Participatory Evaluation is and that this discussion could start at the Admin Board.</p> <p>This is where agency can combined efforts for a research project. The Framework is not just for students but for FACS in order to have a participatory mindset.</p>
<p><b>Region IV/NNU MSW research project proposal</b></p>	<p>1:30</p>	<p>Heather Slavin-Taylor and Dawn Doepke</p>	<p>Dawn Doepke and Heather Slavin introduced themselves. Dawn is doing a research project and Heather is supervising Dawn.</p> <p>Dawn's proposal for research is a review of removal episodes in foster care in which substance abuse was a factor. It was indicated that there is not good reporting due to the lack of tracking.</p> <p>It was difficult to find a report that documents statistics on substance abuse, so she obtained removal episodes which includes child in care during this time. The statistics had no identifying factors to them. So Dawn had to read the narratives to confirm whether or not substance abuse was a factor. She had to dig farther for case management to see if there was testing for drug use. She compiled a break-down on what type of drug is used. She conveyed that there is a higher use of prescription drug addiction in removal incidents.</p> <p>The purpose of this project is to determine what percentages of removals are done relative to substance abuse. The latest numbers were up to 428 from 350 in 2006. Her data was with kids in Region 4.</p> <p>From a program perspective this was seen as valuable information. There is a need to dig deeper in issues of permanency so this baseline helpful. There is also the need to determine if this is the first or a repeat incident. She hasn't looked at race; however, the information may not be accurate for race. The inconsistent reporting by FOCUS prompted the initial discussions on consistent documentation.</p> <p>Children are removed on endorsement so there is a need to dig in and obtain secondary reports on removals.</p> <p>Foster care licensing has a removal report with homes in region 4.</p>

			<p>By the federal standards, there is a need to provide the real reason for child removal. If one doesn't assess properly, children can be lost in the system. More training on substance abuse will help in the assessing.</p> <p>It was then brought up that when Research is checked in the Framework, there should be another form to do; a form B. The participatory process does not fit into research and data collecting. The current Framework gets them to engage the stakeholders for the needed data.</p> <p>Research should be tied to a Program Evaluation and that research would fit into a bigger picture and what works with the department and not just professor. Then the information can be used to better improve the department. It would help drive FOCUS improvement. Until FOCUS is analyzed, it cannot generate accurate information. This is a step to this.</p> <p>A contribution from this research is to the FOCUS system. Example of poorly recorded removal episode vs. an accurate one is when a removal is recorded and it is listed as abandonment when it was an endorsement. It is the coding by FOCUS that is not accurate.</p> <p>At the Chiefs meeting it was said there were 40, so it was thought that this was a data collection issue since 80 is national. So there were discussions on this. They did see percentage of substance abuse go up when the training was done for completing the necessary information.</p> <p>The original plan was to get accurate statistics on substance abuse. A list of variables would be beneficial- (geographic, the home of removal, race/ethnicity). The current research data variables would include- data removal, why children are removed, physical neglect, drug abuse, previously in foster care prior to 2007, etc.</p> <p>Risk assessment and risk factors- How is substance abuse assessment done? Unless a parent discloses this, or there is collateral information, or there is evidence, then there is no listing of substance abuse. Once assessed they are sent to treatment.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>If a risk assessor doesn't know what to look for, that risk assessor may grab the wrong items and not know how to enter the information to get accurate statistics.</p> <p>After the baseline data, what a report looks like will be used for region 4 improvements and then shared outside region 4. Ideal that report goes to the department and the department then disseminates it properly. This can be replicated on a database once done.</p> <p>It was noted that CSFR did highlight substance abuse as something that needs to be worked on.</p> <p>Project Time frame- Dec 2008. The project was being done for practicum hours and to benefit department.</p> <p>Dawn and Heather were Invited to come at end of research to link it to other improvements.</p> <p>Where is the manager role in this research? The new form has a place for the Program Manager's signature.</p> <p>May incorporate this research information into the Academy.</p> <p><b>APPROVAL PROCESS-</b> The Evaluation Board needs to come up with a document indicating that a project is approved. A stage of who is part of this process hasn't been reached yet.</p> <p>Can pull what the framework wants and then the board can indicate which results they want. Writing a research piece on a mixed framework and then drawing general conclusions can be inaccurate information. Having a participatory and research framework can help keep students on track.</p> <p><b>Changes of Framework-</b> The research with a hypothesis may not be for program improvement and so the framework isn't relevant. Field based research is action research and researching oneself doing things one way and then another and what works and doesn't work. Action research by designed is participatory.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Clear input from the Evaluation Board will be helpful for students for projects.</p> <p>Having the manager, supervisor, and chief all invested in the project is important.</p> <p><b>Draft of Research Framework-</b> It was request that Rick make a draft of the research framework. Rick will make one.</p> <p>How does the Partnership influence what the university does for improvement of practice? This way what is researched also helps the department. The Admin Board can discuss this.</p> <p>There are two sets of students- IV-E and those driven by their own research. EWU master students have been shifting to action based research because they want learning to improve practice. All social workers should be able to self-evaluate and self-assess.</p> <p>If the Evaluation Board is to have a role in this, it would help to avoid long research that is not approved.</p> <p><b>Lawanna's Research Project</b> Lawanna is working on research and handed out the research questions. This is asking questions on the data; a person's worldview and how it affects their work practice. The source she is using is business related.</p> <p>Various areas were defined such as, 1) view of the world, 2) good and evil, 3) time viewpoint- past, present or future. It was explained that this was sort of a Myer's Bridge and the goal is to look at where person comes from.</p> <p>A grid was handed out with a focus on the regions where disproportionality is the greatest and whether the area was an urban/rural mix. Most of the cultural information was from the perspective of the business world. Significant portion of children were listed as bi-racial but there was no indication as to what the races were.</p> <p>What can the Evaluation Board do to help this project? Brian has</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>helped answer the data questions. Lawanna will send what she has to Mardell, Rick, and Brian so that the methodology and the process will fit with what they are looking for.</p> <p>This research is on regional characteristics. It is looking at regional variables that can lead to disproportionality in the state.</p>
<b>Partnership Goal #1</b>	2:00		
<b>FGDM Update and New FOCUS Report</b>	2:30	Ed Byrnes (by phone)	<p>The call by Ed Byrnes did not take place. Here is an email he sent regarding this:</p> <p>I regret that I had to miss my call in for our meeting. We were driving in a part of Southern Montana and Eastern Idaho off Monida Pass that precluded my calling in. I thought I would have been further south and within the Idaho Falls cell phone range by that time, but you know how traveling with kids can be.</p> <p>I doubly regret it because I have news to report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I am beginning my work with Wendy Nutting at the Region 1 Office and am pleased with the way things initially look for me to gather my outcome data independently.</li> <li>2. We discussed my sending a letter to Frank about what I perceive is the simple IT glitch and I have sent that off to him.</li> </ol> <p>Things are getting to where I can be more focused this summer and if at all possible I would like to travel to Boise to participate in the next evaluation board meeting in person. There are a few dates when I am solely responsible for my children so if there is some flexibility in scheduling please let me know. Conversely if you know of any baby sitters in Boise....</p> <p>Please accept my apology and convey my regrets to our peers.</p> <p>Ed</p>

<p><b>HR/FACS Exit Interviews</b></p>	<p>3:00</p>	<p>Paul Spannkebel</p>	<p>Paul Spannkebel with Human Resources arrived to share HR information. An explanation of the Partnership and how each Partnership board is developing strategies for their goals and addressing questions to the Evaluation Board was given. A continual question that came up from some of the boards was why were child welfare workers leaving the department and where can they get information as to why they are leaving. This led to the question: How can we partner together with various divisions so that there is data to support the changes in practice when that is desirable?</p> <p>It was added that the Admin Board has decided to provide context for the action boards around three areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Recruitment of the workforce and resource families</li> <li>2) Retention of the workforce and resource families</li> <li>3) Mitigating disparity in outcomes of youth of color.</li> </ol> <p>Three action boards are interested in why people in the workforce are leaving the department and are trying to go from baseline to outcome and currently there is no baseline or one that is not understandable.</p> <p>Paul explained that information is gathered manually from exit interviews.</p> <p>Some of the statistical information he provided was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hired 28 people in 2007</li> <li>• Hired 25 people in 2008</li> <li>• Hired total 53 people in 2007-2008</li> <li>• 72 left the workforce in 2007-2008</li> <li>• 16.2% turnover rate for 2007-2008</li> </ul> <p>Where They Are Leaving</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2007- 55% competitors, 13% out of state, 13% another career, 16% retired</li> <li>• 2008- 60% competitors, 18% out of state, 12% another career 7% retired</li> </ul> <p>Reason For Leaving</p> <p>42% caseload overload, 35% stress, 10% pay, 7% morale, 6% supervisor</p>
---------------------------------------	-------------	------------------------	---

			<p>Region 4 has lost 21 social workers during this time period.</p> <p>HR will have a reporting system for DA and have that information reported by region. This will be within a month. Dashboard will look like division scorecards.</p> <p>The average tenure is 1.6-2.7 years. The stats show that there is a loss of 18 people in the five year range. This is a flag.</p> <p>It was noted that when there is a good relationship with the supervisor, there is a better way to do determine what the specific reason for leaving is.</p> <p>Also that good recruiting can lead to good retention. Screening should be done at the beginning and those who look as if they will not last in this profession should be weeded out at the beginning. Once one is hired, then that new recruit needs good supervision.</p> <p>It was asked whether it would be better to see why people are staying and what supports they receive that helps them decide to stay in the profession. A challenge is that surveys on staff satisfaction could not be done. Yet surveys to find out why people stay can be used as a recruitment item.</p> <p>It was asked whether or not it would be good for Michelle to speak with Dick to about a survey and having it packaged and utilized.</p> <p>The classification system is a recruitment frustration. The system used by Idaho is not used by many states and was a 1950s system. The state works at getting applicants is not a recruiting but a hiring system. The hiring list generates names for hiring; recruiting begins when resumes are reviewed.</p> <p>Using this current system frustrates HR and hinders the recruiting process. It was discussed using Maine Michigan recruitment videos.</p> <p>The place to put the energy is on resiliency- what makes one stay. What are the good things that keep people in the system?</p> <p>Observation by Paul is that commitment to public service is the</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>reason that people are staying. It is like the heart of a volunteer.</p> <p>It was brought up that only looking at what keeps a person will not answer the reasons people leave that do need to be worked on. The key that was brought up is workload. The number of cases people in the workforce have is sinking them, and they may not have expected such a work load. Si there is a needs to be better way to manage caseloads.</p> <p>Need to have both what works and a realistic look at the work load.</p> <p>It was brought up that at the 1<sup>st</sup> Annual Child Welfare Conference there will be a session where there is a break down longevity of workers so that different issues such as workload, stress, etc. can be looked at. A survey asking the three times one felt like quitting and what made the person stay is planned. The goal is to predict the thought processes and have developmental stages in place.</p> <p>It was also indicated that rather than surveys, the best way to get information is to talk face to face, peer to peer and take notes to get the information.</p>
<b>Partnership Goal #2 &amp; #3</b>	4:00		
<b>Adjourn</b>	4:30		<p>Action steps were reviewed with the following assignments:</p> <p>Brian is to put together a research project acceptance letter for anyone who wants approval on a project. This will have an approval sheet first completed by the program manager and supervisor before it goes to Evaluation Board.</p> <p>Brian will do a flow chart on what ideally should happen here- FFI, University partners, etc.</p> <p>It was recommended to take this to the Admin Board for a developmental goal on the research projects for schools.</p> <p>Rick will do an outline of participatory and research framework.</p> <p>Mardell will help to get these on the Admin Board agenda.</p>

			HR information will be taken back to Academy Board.
--	--	--	---