Colorado Children and Youth Information Sharing Collaborative
Meeting Minutes
September 21, 2011 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM
Location JCJAC – Large Training Room

CCYIS Vision:

Children, youth and families experience seamless and collaborative services and supports that are responsive to their interests and needs. This is facilitated by information sharing that safeguards their privacy at both the state and local level.

CCYIS Mission:

To develop strategies for sharing information to optimize services available and delivered to children, youth and families in Colorado.

Attendees

, Director IPS, CDPHE
Jeff McDonald, Director, JEFFCO JAC
Meg Williams, Manager, CDPS, DCJ
Anna Lopez, Grant Manager, DCJ
Jan Petro, Director CDE
Julie Marshall, Professor, UCD-CSPH
Margie Grimsley, TA Coordinator, FFCMHCC
Kelly Abbott, SB94 0 18th JD
Sean McCaw, Data Supervisor, CDHS-CW
Peggy Baikie, Program Mgr NP, Denver Health
Susie Hall, Student, Metropolitan
Allie Miller, Coordinator 1451 Morgan County
Katie Wells, Manager Youth SA Services, CDHS-DBH
Susan Colling, Probation Specialist, Judicial
Juston Cooper, ED, JEFFCO
Ida Drury, Project Director, CDE
Erin Ingoldsty, Evaluator, OMNI
Amber Elias, Attorney, Denver Public Schools
Angie Wickersham, Director HTOP, Mesa County – on telephone
Chris Duclos, Evaluator CND/JSI
Stephanie Rondenell, CND
Susan Laniewski, Privacy and Security Consultant - CND
Russell Burton, CND
Joan Masztaler, CND
Sarah Caron, CND

Minutes from August 21, 2011 meeting were reviewed and approved.

Strategic Plan

- Russell Burton – Working on final phase of strategic planning document which is the plan of action component. Please look at the plan of action document (handed out at meeting) which identifies **six key issues** that need to be addressed over the course of this year. Today we'll look at those issues and come up with potential leaders or committees to address each issue, look at some tasks and identify timelines for each.

- Is there any feedback on the key issues or the priority that is represented in the handout? Group agreed with documents provided as no other feedback was provided.

Key Issue #1

- Identify and create elements of a core record
    - Scope identifies what we are looking for with each issue.
    - Goal from leadership is to come up with a universal record. Jeff McDonald had brought up the CUPID as a possibility to start, but as this group we want to focus on a core record that will go across all boundaries.
    - Do we need a committee to address this issue or who is going to lead this task? CND will be involved with each leader/committee along the process but we need champions internally to lead these efforts.
    - José Esquibel discussed that there is a good chance that CCYIS knows what the fields for the core record are. There is probably a wealth of knowledge in the Collaborative to address this and come up with a draft fairly rapidly.
    - Russell Burton – we have each individual agency present so if we have a dedicated meeting or part of a meeting where everyone shows up with the documentation that they would require for the core record we could pull it together as on uniform document. We can leave the leadership committee as the residing committee but would start with Collaborative.
    - Ida Drury added that she is currently involved with an extensive data collection between three states who are engaged in the same practice. The data you would be pulling from the multiple systems needs to have quality assurance to ensure that the data pulled from one source doesn't conflict with another source.
    - José Esquibel – Initially what we want to do with the core record is be able to identify the fields of information and then come up with consensus of what a core record could be for all of us, no matter what the discipline.
    - Meg Williams - Purpose of establishing the core record is finding the items that when **System A** is trying to figure out what are in **System B,** that these elements will identify that you have the right child. Research allows for algorithms that can be utilized to help identify that this is the right child. Those are the key elements so the systems can identify across that **yes**, you have the right child and the next step would be: Why do you require that information? How do you get it and, criteria to get it.
    - Chris Duclos – those algorithms would identify by all those fields that you want to match so you can determine you have the right kid.
    - Sean McCaw mentioned that he starts to get a bit concerned that HCPF and child support and CBMS aren't involved in the CCYIS meetings. He is getting pressure to look at systems like mental health and substance abuse, Medicaid, child welfare, but none of these are represented. There is an interface between TRAILS and child support and DISH - these systems are not involved in the CCYIS meetings – many missing pieces. Need technical representatives as well.

- *José Esquibel stated that these are points to add as tasks*. May require meetings outside of this meeting to identify other groups we need to bring to the table.
- Groups need to bring to table – Child Support, HCPF, CBMS, DISH
- Meg Williams encouraged everyone to think about who else isn't here that needs to be brought in.
- Margie Grimsley asked what DISH is?
- Sean McCaw explained that it is an automated connection between the court systems which is sending the judicial court record information to make sure that child support orders are being followed. There is a summary report on the internet.
- Stephanie Rondenell – it was a grant that was received by Dept of Human Services in CO. They worked with judicial to set up data exchanges for petitions, child support orders.
- Juston Cooper added that DISH stands for Data Information Sharing.
- Stephanie Rondenell added that right now it's only the child support and petition data.
- Russell Burton stated that we have been discussing the need to bring other voices to the table. Should we identify that as a key issue separately, or should it be a subset of the existing key issues? It appears that bringing in more people will fall under a number of the key issues and membership on these committees will become a task for many of the key issues. **An ongoing task is to add additional partners to the CCYIS**.
- Russell Burton – we'll keep this task in the Collaboration group and try to give enough notice prior to the meeting so that we can start with CND identifying some of those key factors.
- José Esquibel – we can start with Collaboration but might need some adhoc meetings to bring in specific people as we need them.
- Russell Burton – What is your resource for this task? This committee, people we can bring into this committee, and forms from each agency.
- Meg Williams pointed out that there is a need to tap some of those organizations who already have this work done so that we can build on what is already there.
- Margie Grimsley brought up that this should be a huge piece of our communication plan. How are we communicating with others? How can we connect with those who are writing grants so that we eliminate duplication of work or reducing the confusion of people doing something differently in their own silos of information?
- Russell Burton reminded the group that as we develop the strategic plan it has to fit into the governance structure and communication plan (which are already created). And it also has to fall within OIT's plan which has already been created. We are going to have to cross check with these documents and takes it a step further into what are other groups doing and how do we integrate with that. We encourage each of you to get very familiar with the governance structure and communication plan. There is work product out there that has already been developed for the group, you just have to use the tools already created.

- José Esquibel asked if TROUX would have anything we could be of value in terms of what is being entered into it that we could pull from as a starting point for a core record?
- Stephanie Rondenell stated that most state agencies have provided information into TROUX, but there is a chance that it won't be utilized. The information that is in it won't go to waste but the actual application may not be useful.
- José Esquibel asked if we could still pull from the fields that are in TROUX.
- Stephanie Rondenell said that it may or may not be useful. But the system does have about 50% of the state agencies system information and data is in that system.
- José Esquibel – what about the NIEM domains, is there anything at that level that would become a checking point for us?
- Stephanie Rondenell – What has been done is we've taken the virtual traffic data warehouse and gathered their data dictionaries and run a gap analysis against National Information Exchange Model (NIEM). We've identified the data that was in it and where it was located, what the definition were and what it looked like and identified what data was not in the national model. From there the IT people could tag this data using the NIEM protocols.
- Stephanie Rondenell stated that once you identify the core record there are ways to run it against the national model. We could set up the core record and have it all NIEM'd and ready to go and then just have to identify people who want to exchange it with us.
- José Esquibel – it would be advantageous as we set up the core record to align it with NIEM.
- Chris Duclos recommended that we tap some of the states that are already up and running as a resource. Look at Missouri core record and see what worked for them and what didn't.
- Stephanie Rondenell commented that she has contacts with Missouri, Florida and Hawaii that we might be able to access their core records.
- Jeff McDonald suggested we talk to Don Quick regarding the Polk County Iowa system
- Stephanie Rondenell commented that the Polk County system is no longer used, it was shut down due to funding. Probably need to utilize a different reference for the core record because it was only law enforcement and schools that were sharing the data. Thus it's not a complete core record.
- Meg Williams added that CCYIS needs to get engagement from CJIS. CJIS has input from DYC, the courts, etc. and they have databases that would be beneficial to the group as a whole. We need to re-engage them in the group.
- It was suggested that we might need representation from the CORHIO
- José Esquibel **said he will touch base with them**.
- Russell Burton suggested that we look at the desire to have working product for the summit meeting which is one of the other key issues. It is recommended that this summit happen in the spring or summer of 2012. Thus what is a realistic timeframe to complete the core record?
- Stephanie Rondenell has a copy of the TROUX data and she would need to do a comparison, hopefully with the help of Sean McCaw.

- Spend time on this at the October or November meeting and pull together something by December 2011.
- Stephanie Rondenell – TROUX is a enterprise architecture tool which pulls in all the data dictionaries and all the system information from all the state agencies so they would have a full picture of what everyone had, who had what data, what kind of system it was running on etc.

Key Issue #2

- Data Exchanges
  - Meg Williams discussed the top ten data exchanges. Matrix includes agencies across **x** axis and **y** axis shows what they need to share. Then what are the rules and laws that impact that sharing of information? This will also help dispel some myths of roadblocks to sharing information. We can develop protocols that say what really, legally can be shared and under what conditions. And then get the word out about what can be shared. Idea is to identify the top things we want to start with sharing across systems. Helps to dig into the reality about the rules, regulations and policies and identify what might not be completely accurate. It's been too hard to figure out how you tackle some of these issues and maybe this matrix will break it into smaller pieces. We could also decide which groups might have the most pressing issues or are closer to being ready to share information and then just work way through the matrix. Makes it more manageable.
  - Russell Burton – so then who leads this issue, a committee or person?
  - José Esquibel commented that the privacy committee was decided upon earlier.
  - Meg Williams stated that the privacy committee with specific people or agencies would be invited as their information is needed. The collaboration could help determine what are some of the top data exchanges and then the privacy committee will start digging into the laws and rules about it. Need buy in from the whole group because they are the guiding force from each agency and then the privacy would take it from there.
  - Russell Burton clarified that like in issue one, probably a meeting within the collaboration and then bring it to privacy after that.
  - Joan Masztaler brought up the resources. Are there any other resources that we can engage in this task? The timeline for a spring or summer summit might require some help.
  - Stephanie Rondenell suggested the Ron Ozga and Galina Krivoruk (application director) could be additional resources. They are looking at doing some data exchanges which might benefit other agencies here. They've already done data exchanges and they have a good idea of what data is where and where some problems are. Might want to invite them to a meeting to discuss this.
  - Meg Williams added that there is funding in the grant that is set aside and might be utilized for further resources. Meg assumes lead on this task and would like to have someone available to support that and do some outreach and make sure we got the right people to the table.
  - Chris Duclos said that in regard to the informed consent and authorization, she might have contacts that might be resources as well. Could help with developing informed consent processes.

- Meg Williams agreed that bringing in the research side is a good idea as well. When she thinks about data exchanges she focuses on the data that practitioners need to help assist families, but need to incorporate the research side. Need to look at it from both view points (direct service and research) so we can track services across all systems and see what menu of services are most successful.
- Chris Duclos – we have to investigate because we might have to have two authorizations. Evaluation is one thing but once you get into research it's a whole new ball game. Most of work will probably be in evaluation, but we might have researchers who come in and want to ask questions.
- Ida Drury stated that Casey Family Programs is involved in child welfare in Colorado and they might be interested in this discussion. Might be implications in their work in terms of improving outcomes for kids, might also be some resources and funding.
- Sean McCaw brought up ARCh (Applied Research in Child Welfare) and the CSU evaluation group regarding child welfare practices and outcomes. They have had to walk between different applications. They might not be someone to include all the time, but maybe a resource.
- Chris Duclos – Having a track for evaluators and researchers at the summit to talk through some of the work products and see what they might want or need as well.
- Ida Drury commented that at the very least including CSU, as a part of that project. There are very few methods for researchers to pull data sets across multiple systems. They would be very interested in the possibilities.
- Julie Marshall said that there is increasing action in integrating research and practice. UCD has a group that is looking at research regarding information sharing which might need to be included.
- Russell Burton – relative to task, do we need to better define the matrix or do we feel it is sufficient?
- Meg Williams stated that we won't really know if the matrix is sufficient until we start using it.
- Task for Data Exchanges: Completing a few exchanges within the matrix to know if there are any changes which need to be addressed. Or anything else that needs to added to it.
- José Esquibel added that once we get those examples things will start coming up. Once we start defining those data exchanges, those first few will probably bring up the majority of issues for the rest of the data exchanges.
- Russell Burton discussed timeframe and what do we want to set as a deadline?
- Meg Williams felt that May 2012 would be realistic. That doesn't mean it will hold up number three because once we get an exchange started these will come up.
- Joan Masztaler do we want to block this out a little bit to say we will start with a few of those groups?
- This will be started right away so let's go with April.
- Sara Boylan asked if Meg thought she would want to do focus groups to get feedback on the data exchange points. If so she would have individuals who could contribute to that process.

- Meg Williams agreed that having practitioners input is the best way to approach that. Need to engage practitioners in this discussion and gain approval.
- José Esquibel recommended that the 1451 group could be beneficial.

Key Issue #3

- Identify Inconsistent Policies
  - Russell Burton – As Meg stated this one can go hand in hand with Key Issue #2
  - José Esquibel touched on the fact that some of this has already been started within the privacy committee and the work on informed consent. We've identified inconsistencies in the way that informed consent has been utilized. It's not so much inconsistent policy as it is inconsistent practice. Policy is very vague and needs to be better defined. This was uncovered by looking at data exchanges and Susan has drafted forms to guide people in that respect. If we could get that informed consent work done, draft forms together as well as identifying policy and practice recommendations this can be completed in the next several months. Through data exchanges we'll uncover other policy issues that will need to be addressed.
  - This effort will be led by the Privacy committee primarily with items being brought to collaboration as necessary.
  - Russell Burton agreed that this work is already under way and there has already been good movement forward regarding consent and policies. The task piece can be skipped on this one because privacy has a good foundation of how to complete this already.
  - Chris Duclos wanted to clarify if we are talking about the informed consent form or training protocols etc. The form is the easy part, but when it comes down to what do we want agencies to do in the process of informing people. What kind of training do we need, what information is needed to have or get that might need to be addressed?
  - Stephanie Rondenell stated that we currently have tasks mapped out until November or December, but this is just one. We've also got other use cases that we are getting ready to go through so this will be ongoing. Every time you do a data exchange you have to walk through the process and when you have multiple agencies walking through their procedures you will find gaps and inconsistencies and training problems. Once we start moving through some of this, hopefully it won't be as complicated. When groups spoke with Senator Newell she asked when we would be done with this process and it had to be explained that this is an ongoing process. Information sharing is a never ending process.
  - José Esquibel suggested that there are milestones and pieces that can show progress towards that goal (ex. Standards on informed consent).
  - Stephanie Rondenell agreed that once we work out the consent process you can pick that up and use it for other data exchanges that require that kind of complexity. But since we don't have all agencies at the table the policies and inconsistencies will have to reviewed and updated as we go.
  - Chris Duclos added that on the research end regulations are changing daily, so it's going to always have to be reviewed.

- Joan Masztaler asked if timeframe should be based on the 80/20 rule or should there not be a time frame.
- Stephanie Rondenell said that we should identify milestones. From there you have the top ten data exchanges and identify those in a meeting. Mapping those out and identify policies, agencies, partners and what the procedures are could take up to three months for this task. You could say by May 2012 we could get three data exchanges completely mapped out. If we get more that's great, but this is a realistic timeline.

Key Issue #4

- Plan for strategic Change Management
  - Jeff McDonald stated that we had talked about change management in terms of sustainability and should we lump them together or should they be separate? But it is truly a separate ongoing piece. We need to be able to manage that as we go through certain tasks and as work load shifts to other people we will need to address change management. There's lots of research and ways of handling change management that should be addressed on a case by case ongoing level.
  - Margie Grimsley added that there is a need to actually get something that is consistent and focused and that families can trust. Families should be able to go from agency to agency and expect to be treated in consistent ways. Recognize that practice has to be a certain way and that would include the exception of sharing information in an appropriate way instead of making it up as you go. Recognizing that there are situations that will have to be addressed in a different way depending on the circumstances around that particular person. Show that the change is done well for everyone not just for systems to make it cost effective or streamlined but it benefits those the information is being shared about?
  - Stephanie Rondenell asked if that is the definition of doing it well. That everybody knows; the family is involved and, educated along with the system?
  - Margie Grimsley – They know it is just a given, not the exception.
  - Joan Masztaler asked if some of that would fall under the previous tasks, quality control. Because that's what is coming across is that policy and data exchanges issues might address this area.
  - Stephanie Rondenell clarified that it doesn't only fall under quality control but that it's been done accurately (data being accurate) and appropriately (consent, process and procedures) and then you have the best practice that you pull out for training.
  - José Esquibel stated that if we do link this to the top ten data exchanges that we begin to identify in the informed consent. We then have two very concrete things that we can start working on to induce change. The idea is to not spring surprises on people in ten months and say here's all the new policy recommendations. We want to get some of this info out there about what we are working on and make it broad enough that people realize the benefit of the change. Let people look at it so that people aren't completely surprised.
  - Stephanie Rondenell added that this is in the communication plan.
  - Russell Burton suggested that you have the communication plan as a guide and the newsletter might be another resource to push this information out. Under the

scope of identifying key audiences and stake holders, we'll be engaging new people perhaps broaden the base of who gets the newsletter so that different people are seeing the work product on a regular basis.

- Stephanie Rondenell stated that the newsletter is a small piece of that because it's short snippets of what everyone is doing. If you use the newsletter to educate, it will become huge and overwhelming.
- Russell Burton suggested that we could still use it as an underlying tool.
- Stephanie Rondenell stated that in her experience people won't read a huge document because everyone is busy and has a million other things to do. The problem is that it's not in their face all the time, it isn't constantly coming to them and it gets forgotten.
- Anna Lopez commented that the newsletter is a good place to get people interested in our work, but it's not necessarily to change their mind. Changing their mind is more of an action oriented situation that is going to take more than just reading something in the newsletter.
- Juston Cooper raised the idea of a TA team to assist in the action of changing people's mind. They would look at the structure of how we are going to work with the distribution of change management and the influences on policies and practice. Some sort of committee or TA group that could address implementation of the change we are suggesting.
- Russell Burton suggested that this would be an area for a subcommittee to come into play and address this issue in more detail.
- Margie Grimsley added that supplying a toolkit for family organizations across the state that would focus on information sharing and what families should expect and be asking. Simultaneously creating a piece to educate families so they know what to share, how to share it and what questions they need to ask. There are many ways we could be educating families on what they need to know so that they can be our partners in this change.
- José Esquibel stressed the need for having contact with key trade associations and practitioner's. If they understand that the changes are coming, they have a broader network to tap into.
- Joan Masztaler pointed out that there are some tasks in the previous issues that would look specifically at agencies and data exchanges that will bring up people who need to be engaged. The people that are impacted by these systems will be interested in how it will affect them. Interjects the "Why do I care" to buy into this change. The committee/TA team will have to come up with some specific items around a TA plan and measurement to get buy in from the ones who are in the trenches with this every day.
- Russell Burton – We will need to establish a subcommittee to address this area.
- Margie Grimsley said she would recommend rolling the family committee into this group, at least for a little while. She feels that this is very much a system change area and thinks the family committee would have good input.
- Julie Marshall brought up that the Department of Family Medicine and the school of medicine has been conducting studies of system and practice change across the state. This group might be a resource for this task. One of the things they've been

testing is having a coach facilitator within the practices that support that change process.

- Chris Duclos said she is on the faculty for Family Medicine so she could help with this.
- José Esquibel – Given the data exchange work and informed consent we can start working with these and getting information out more consistently than quarterly. So we need to get a committee started and get them thinking about how we can get a parallel alignment with the work in the privacy and collaboration group. This would include identifying key stakeholders and how to present the information to them, whether through a toolkit or packet or TA group or meeting.
- Jeff McDonald agreed that the other key issues are the foundation for driving this group, but there does need a group structure there to support this task when we get the product done.
- Stephanie Rondenell pointed out that each person within the CCYIS should be encouraging change management in every meeting they go to. Information always comes up so it's the message that you are sending and the tools you leave in their hands when you leave that meeting. When she first started talking about information sharing, every meeting/conference she went to she had to educate people so it became part of their vocabulary. It seems tedious and may be boring for those who know it so well, but for people who have never heard of it or thought of it or conceived of the process behind it, it's a constant education for them. Whatever you can think of that will be helpful to you to get the word out and educate, there are tools out there (website, executive briefing, newsletter etc). The website has meeting minutes, background documents, governance structure, and communication plan in electronic copy. These can all be used by each individual in change management.
- José Esquibel recommended this committee would take a look at what is already there and create some sort of toolkit to use when sharing information about CCYIS. This could include the latest from this month and it would provide a consistent message.
- Susan Laniewski stated that there are already a lot of tools out there, but the best tool is the individual being able to present the information over and over again. Likened it to a commercial that you hear over and over and all of a sudden you know what it is from memory. It's almost like creating a team song or motto, a couple key messages that you blend into everything you are doing. Need to keep the message simple, but give them updates about each step. She also suggested that people add a link to the CCYIS web page at the bottom of their e-mail. That's something that people could click on and it reminds them of what is being done.
- Juston Cooper stated that there is a need for messaging within the toolkit that is concise. It's important to have some sort of follow-up when we're out there as ambassadors for the work. Stakeholders are the executive leadership of Jefferson County so when they ask for information it is important to have some sort of follow-up from this committee or group. Need support behind it so that when we do get people interested there has to be a clear message that can be presented.

Key Issue #5

- Sustainability
  - Russell Burton commented that this has more to do with keeping this group moving forward beyond June of 2012
  - José Esquibel addressed the fact that this is probably the more challenging part of any project, and thinking beyond just money. The leadership group did talk about looking for some other resources. There are probably resources that individuals can draw upon and setting up a sustainability plan, but it's going to take some creative thinking. Need to address what are we trying to sustain and getting clarity on that.
  - Juston Cooper suggested that from a structural stand point if you put it in a committee you isolate it in a steering committee, not another subcommittee. But a key strategy should be to create a succession plan within sustainability. There are components that would encompass the whole group vs. a subcommittee to get to the facilitation side. There are so many components that it should be more of a standing agenda item for the steering committee than a subcommittee.
  - Russell Burton said that maybe we can put that under tasks to integrate this into agenda items.
  - José Esquibel stated that if we are recommending changes to policy we are also encouraging sustainability. Maybe we need to think about what is going to anchor this work and drive this change in practice to occur. We will be transforming the practice field in the process. We need policies, statutes or rules/ procedures that support that and it's part of sustainability.
  - Russell Burton – from a timeline point of view we have the anchors being created from these other issues that you then pull into a sustainability plan?
  - José Esquibel stated that there will probably be more developed as we do more data exchanges.
  - Joan Masztaler added that sustainability will be underwriting all of these other objectives. As you look at data exchanges etc. one of the tasks will be sustainability. Maybe this isn't a standalone but maybe it's a component of each objective.
  - Juston Cooper commented that within that objective we have the outline of the policy side and the succession side. More importantly is that as leadership changes over there is a plan to sustain. So as each area is addressed there is a perspective of sustainability where we need to include policy change and succession to carry on with the work.
  - José Esquibel – if we look at this from the perspective of the other objectives (core record, data exchanges, and informed consent) it makes it more focused and manageable. Otherwise it's so broad and other things may come up from additional work with the data exchanges etc.
  - Stephanie Rondenell added that we might want to keep an eye on the ability to implement. Then you can pull in your evaluator to help measure before and after to determine if you were able to get the information to the agencies better or faster, more accurately, so you can show improvement.

Key Issue #6

- Summit
  - Meg Williams commented on the fact that the summit is going to happen faster than we think. One of the things discussed was who should be there. The research discussion needs to be included. Almost every project currently being worked on has a discussion about how do we find out if it's working, what are the tangible benefit for the systems, families and kids. This would be a good place to bring researchers in and talk about what we've accomplished and get them excited about the possibilities. That's probably not the only facet of the summit.
  - Russell Burton added that we had talked about rolling out the work and showcase some of the items that CCYIS has put together thus far. We could show the core record and talk about data exchanges completed thus far and talking about the inconsistency in policy and what the group has done to strive toward creating consistency. Change management will play into the summit as well because you're getting information out to new components. CCYIS can showcase what has already been done and where it is headed.
  - Chris Duclos suggested that the research piece be more of a track or specific class since it might bore most people. That way only those interested in the research piece would be involved in that portion of the information. The showcase piece is good, but she recommended that it might be good to give the participants something to walk away with, engage them in training and tools etc.
  - Susan Laniewski recommended that the summit be more than just a report card of where we are at, but also a roadmap for future improvements.
  - Stephanie Rondenell stated that we could offer training tracks. Offering a training piece about the children and family bill of Rights for Information Sharing or items coming out of the privacy and consent piece would be suggestions. We could offer a state training with several tracks on consent or some of the unique pieces that come into play with substance abuse and mental health. It may be day to day for this group but do the people on the ground understand the complexities? We might want to introduce some of the consent forms the privacy group is working on.
  - Peggy Baikie asked if this is for the people on the ground or is it for mid level people to say this is coming "tell your folks"?
  - José Esquibel suggested that it might be different tracks for different groups, but we'll have to take some time to think it through. Could target specifics but it will have to come back to the collaboration to discuss further before we set up a committee. It sounds like the core record, informed consent and the top ten data exchanges are pivotal pieces we can focus our energy on and then we can use the change management strategies to promote that work and with an eye toward sustainability. Then could use summit as a spring board to leverage further support.
  - Susan Laniewski reminded that it's not just your directors and agencies that we need to include, but the families and advocates should be included to show that Colorado is moving forward and doing a better job of making clients feel comfortable.

- Stephanie Rondenell added that there are a lot of technology tools that have been developed specifically for children youth and families. We could offer a technology track for IT. The NIEM conference had multiple tracks for different levels of understanding or usefulness
- Chris Duclos reminded the group that all of this should probably be discussed sooner rather than later.
- Julie Marshall suggested having a time where we could develop a use case and walk through the entire process with stakeholders from specific agencies to show what happens to a child through the system.
- Margie Grimsley recommended having families share their stories and incorporating that perspective so that practitioners understand the ramifications of what they share. Get some information from the family perspective.
- Chris Duclos recommended having some families present their story.

Russell Burton closed this section by commending the group for working through a lot of information very quickly and doing a great job. CND will be capturing the information collected at this meeting and sending it out to everyone. There we be a leadership group meeting on October 4th to solidify the strategic plan so please have any feedback or comments submitted by that time.

Newsletter

- José Esquibel quarterly newsletter coming out by mid October
- José Esquibel will be writing the message from the chair piece regarding the key issues identified and where CCYIS will be going with those.
- Chris Duclos can write up a short explanation of the focus group data. This needs to be discussed further before a decision is made on what to include of this.
- Allie Miller is going to submit a county update, Morgan County.
- Julie Marshall will send something about her group.
- Angie Wickersham can write a briefing on their local best practices group.
- Stephanie Rondenell will add the national update piece as usual.
- Susan Laniewski suggested introducing new members in this edition.
- José Esquibel will submit a summary of webinar for the Forum for Youth Investment

All articles for the newsletter are due by 9/29/11

Agency Updates

- José Esquibel discussed providing an update on CCYIS' progress at the upcoming Prevention Leadership Council meeting. He will be asking for better support from OIT.
- Sherri Hammons – Chief Technology Officer, will be attending next month's meeting.
- Meg Williams gave an update on the presentation to the legislative task force. They were all individuals who are involved with data issues on some level. Senator Nolan commented that she appreciated what CCYIS was doing and will be telling others about our work. It seemed like the information was helpful as many people didn't realize the problems that exist with information sharing and consent.
- Julie Marshall discussed a conference engaging communities & education.

Focus Group Update

- Chris Duclos – update on focus groups, handout provided with preliminary information that is not be shared beyond the CCYIS at this time.
  - What really came forth in the information collected was that getting accurate information is extremely important.
  - Stephanie Rondenell commented on the fact that consent isn't being given freely.
  - Chris Duclos added that many families are signing these forms in the middle of a crisis and have no idea what they are signing and why. This lends to the inaccurate information being provided.
  - Stephanie Rondenell pointed out that youth are very hesitant to share particular information regarding abuse etc. and realize that there are consequences
  - Chris Duclos also added that computer administration of tests allows for kids to provide less accurate information or answer questions deliberately knowing that if they answered honestly it would get them more services, classes or punishment.
  - Meg Williams said that the lack of face to face time within the system is interesting. If you don't engage these kids you are not going to get accurate information.
  - Sara Boylan added that the MAYSI is completed so many times that it actually takes away from the effectiveness of the testing.
  - Peggy Baikie included that you are eliminating the caring factor when you lose the face to face contact or conversation with a kid.
  - Margie Grimsley reminded the group the personal contact lends to a trusting environment, thus you will get more accurate information. That personal contact is very important to the families and individuals.
  - Chris Duclos commented that this all points to the fact that each kid/family has to have some control.
  - Sara Boylan stated that they have recently addressed a situation where the court has ordered staffing but the parent won't sign the consent forms. In this case the family does have control and it is overriding the court order. Thus family involvement and buy in from them in the process is key.
  - Juston Cooper asked how our best practices shift in order to show results. If we can connect with results the honesty and accuracy of data will increase. It's an issue of results versus compliance.

For next meeting –
Focus Group Summary – Chris Duclos

Next Collaborative Meeting
October 19, 2011 – 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM
Location: JCJAC