



Clark County Department of Family Services

Support and Retention Workgroup Meeting

Meeting Minutes from February 20, 2014 12:00 pm – 2:00 pm

Present

Heather Brockway (SAFY), Audrey Rosenstein (Fostering SN), Karlene Ulibarri (Bountiful Family Services)

DFS Staff - Lani Aitken, Denise Parker, Shannon Rooney, Lauren Soskin

Agenda

- **Introductions**
- **Update on the survey**
- **Retention goals**
- **Advisory Board**

Minutes

Meeting Content:

1. Greetings and introductions were made
 - a. Members were encouraged to bring new attendees to future meetings
2. Minutes from last meeting were discussed
 - a. Minutes from all Quality Parenting Initiative (QPI) work group meetings are now being posted by the QPI coordinator, Denise Parker, on the QPI Nevada Just in Time web site and internal P drive by the tenth (10th) of every month
 - b. Audrey Rosenstein asked what we can do to locate additional members or motivate previous members to start attending again
 - i. Suggested that we go thru the past attendance sheets and make a personal plea for members to start attending again
 - ii. Mentioned members had heard people were dropping out as the workgroup seemed to not be moving forward on action items
 - iii. Suggested clarifying initiatives, moving forward on the long term goals and identifying some short term goals that could be accomplishable more quickly which might spark more interest and show we have measurable goals that can be reported as successes

- iv. Discussed projects can we add to our initiatives that would spark additional interest, motivation and show successes
 - v. Suggested sending prior members meeting minutes to let them know where we are on the objectives
- 3. Update on the Caregiver Survey was given by Shannon Rooney
 - a. Input and additional questions from the Implementation Team meeting, 2/6/14, have been added into the survey
 - b. Items still needing additional input are:
 - i. Survey will need to be translated to Spanish
 - 1. This will be paid for thru the Diligent Recruitment (DR) grant
 - 2. Scope of Work (SOW) to pay for translation is being crafted
 - 3. Approval from Clark County Department of Family Services (DFS) Management has been given to utilize Spanish speaking staff to help with phone calls to administer the survey
 - ii. Reading level of the survey has been questioned
 - 1. Implementation Team members indicated it shouldn't be any higher than a seventh (7th) grade level in order to be accessible to all survey takers
 - 2. Child Trends is looking into this and reviewing the grade level
 - 3. Rewording may need to be done after this review
 - c. Implementation Team had concerns in regard to current policies for the Placement and Receiving departments and holding discussions with caregivers in regard to the amount of time a child will be placed in a home
 - i. Current policy does not allow giving this information to foster homes and survey questions could create large amount of negative answers due to this conflict
 - d. Placement and Receiving sections need to be combined on the survey as caregivers might not know that they were separate departments at DFS
 - e. Survey is TOO long
 - i. Workgroup is finding it difficult to shorten the survey as each time input is received from workgroups, it creates additional length to the survey
 - 1. The questions are all important in order for us to get the information we want to collect with this survey
 - f. Hoping to have the survey ready to submit to this work group for review by end of next week
 - g. It will be submitted to DFS Management for approval after work group review

- h. Once it has been approved by DFS Management, the intent is conduct beta testing with foster parents
 - i. Karlene Ulibarri offered to have the survey administered to foster parents at her monthly foster parent training
 - ii. While this will assist with the beta testing, mentioned that it also needs to be tested on DFS foster parents
 - iii. Suggested that DFS staff members, that are also foster parents, be asked to participate in the beta testing
- i. It is important to be able to accurately tell survey takers how long the survey will take
- j. Alyson Baker covered the suggestions that Child Trends gave as feedback and discussed specific wording of questions with the group so a decision about wording could be made
 - i. A teleconference is being set up with Child Trends to clarify everything and craft it into the survey in a way that is consistent with DFS policies
 - ii. Statistically their suggestions make sense
- k. Discussed the possibility of having printed copies of the surveys available at the Child Haven Visitation Center to have caregivers fill out while they wait during visitations
 - i. Discussed to how completed surveys would be submitted
 - ii. A locked drop box was suggested
 - iii. To make certain the caregivers aren't being contacted more than once, we will have to ensure we are checking them off of the master list of caregivers being surveyed
- l. Options for keeping the survey anonymous were discussed
 - i. Suggested including a self addressed sealed envelope for the last page of the survey which contains the information a survey taker would need to supply in order to receive the gift card
 - 1. Detailed instructions will need to be included with mailed surveys to explain the use of the two envelopes
 - 2. Survey Monkey allows you to create a second "survey" that would collect the information that would be needed for survey takers to receive the gift card
- m. Discussed the existence of a "trust factor" with the surveyed populace
 - i. There is going to be a percentage of people that won't believe us when we tell them it is an anonymous survey
 - ii. Suggested the use of the word *confidential* in place of *anonymous* when making phone calls
- n. Discussed concerns with mailing out surveys
 - i. A very low return rate
 - ii. Phone and on-line are much higher
- o. Having many different opportunities for caregivers to be able to complete the surveys is going to create a bigger response

- p. Discussed the order in which we will attempt to contact caregivers to administer the survey
 - i. Calls
 - ii. E-mails
 - iii. Mail to whoever doesn't respond to the two other options
 - iv. It is hoped that attempting contact in this order will lower the amount of expenditure for mailings
 - v. Suggested that we email first rather than placing a phone call
 - 1. This might reduce the number of phone calls needed
 - 2. Foster Parent Champion (FPC) Program members are making calls right now to update the contact information for all DFS homes
- q. Discussed how we will ensure that the survey is given to a random cross-section of the caregivers
 - i. A list can be generated through DFS records and will involve DFS and agencies licensees but will not include relative caregivers
 - ii. Currently have about nine hundred (900) homes and will need to get three hundred (300) surveys back
- r. Procedures for survey administration will be crafted by DFS staff
- s. Suggested changing the name of the survey to indicate that it is only for LICENSED homes
- t. Questioned whether or not the agency foster homes would be able to accurately answer regarding the length of time it takes to get licensed as they don't go through the same procedure as DFS homes
 - i. Suggested fine tuning the questions to indicate the time frame being referred to as "licensing" would be from the time of attending orientation forward or from initial orientation to receiving your license
- u. Suggested Licensing and Renewal portion of survey need clarification
 - i. Questions regarding renewal could indicate they refer only to *renewals*
 - ii. Suggested we separate the two sections to address each portion individually
 - iii. Suggested we underline *initial* and *renewal* in the questions so that it highlights the differences for the reader
- v. Discussed portion of survey dealing with new placements in the home within the last twelve (12) months
 - i. Needs additional language that clarifies that this is regarding a new child being placed in the home
- w. Discussed language on question regarding *number of children* placed
 - i. Could be specific numbers
 - ii. Could be groupings of numbers as it is currently written
 - 1. Decided to leave it with specific numbers

- iii. If respondent marks zero (0) for new placements, add language to have them move to the next section. (Section C)
 - x. If respondent has no children placed in their home and have not had any within the last twelve (12) months, we need to indicate early in the survey that they should be skipping large portions of the survey as we want to capture information that is more current
 - i. Include language that has them skip to Section D
 - y. Discussed the relevancy of including the question about how long a child will be placed in the home
 - i. Possible violation of DFS policy to have the question remain a part of the survey
 - ii. Placement team has been told by policy that they are not supposed to indicate a time frame for placements when speaking to the resource home
 - 1. They can give information about the specific child, but not the amount of time that the child will be in the placement
 - iii. Decided to remove this question
 - iv. Question thirty two (32) will be removed, but thirty three (33) will remain
 - z. Discussed if we should have the number of years licensed item changed to an option to write in a specific year
 - i. Yes. It will be changed to reflect a space for the respondent to fill in the specific year they were licensed
 - aa. Ages of foster children could be changed to write in options and include information as to their preferences for placement ages
4. Retention Goals Discussed
 - a. Work group is hopeful that a lot of the answers as to how we can do a better job regarding retention will come out of the survey results
 - b. Discussed if the work group should take a look at the number of licenses being closed versus the number of licenses being opened
 - i. Noted that there are more licenses being closed than opened with both DFS and agency homes
 - ii. Suggested it would be good to take a snap shot in time, perhaps 2013, and see why the closed homes actually closed
 - 1. The reasons quality homes are closing needs to be examined
 - 2. If closure reason was due to adoptions, it is not a retention issue
 - 3. Discussed we would need to include closures due to adoptions as that may not be the only reason they are closing their license
 - 4. If it was due to reasons other than adoption, this indicates where we need to concentrate our retention efforts
 - 5. A review of this nature would help identify trends

- iii. Asked if the reasons for license closure in UNITY are accurate
 - 1. There is a tendency to not indicate the specific reason they are closing
 - 2. Was suggested we need to survey our families when they are leaving to get the information we need
 - 3. Suggested we craft an exit report to be filled out when they close the license that would capture “teachable moments” for DFS about our systems
 - a. This would make us better and help us to retain future quality parents
 - 4. Suggested we should we look at having an outside person conduct exit interviews with them as to why they are closing their licenses
 - a. Would eliminate licensee’s concerns that they can’t tell DFS staff about issues they may have had with DFS staff or procedures
 - 5. A report can be pulled from UNITY indicating all closures so the work group could conduct a review of the reasons why licenses closed
 - a. We may find that starting January of 2014 we need to adjust the options available as reasons stated for closures on the UNITY system
 - b. A review of this report will allow us to send this year’s license closures the exit report suggested above once it is crafted
 - 6. This will help drive system changes
 - 7. Discussed if we should include the relative caregivers in this overview
 - a. Suggested that maybe this is a group that we are overlooking for recruitment efforts
 - b. Suggested that looking at the relative care givers closures be shifted to the recruitment work group
 - 8. Members will look into creating the UNITY report for 2013 and bringing the information to the next meeting

5. Advisory Board

- a. Was changed to Policy and Information Task Force and will be discussed at the next meeting

Next Meeting:

- 1. Next meeting date, second (2nd) Thursday of the Month, March 13, 2014 (12:30 pm — 2:00 pm), room selection to be announced at a later date