

**Child Welfare ID Managers' Webinar Series: Child Welfare Information Technology
Systems Managers and Staff**

Bridging the Partner Gap - Best Practices and Working with the Courts

March 26, 2015

Presenters: **Joyce Rose**, ICF International
Kate Shufeldt, Court Improvement Program Director
Nellena Garrison, SACWIS Manager, Children's Reporting Information
System (CRIS), Arkansas Department of Human Services, Office of Systems
and Technology

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. At this time, all participants' lines
will remain on a listen only mode. During the question and answer session,
please press star and 1 on your touchtone telephone.

Today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may
disconnect at this time. I would like to turn today's call over to Joyce Rose.
You may begin.

Joyce Rose: Hello, and welcome to the child welfare information technology system's
managers and staff Webinar series brought to you on behalf of the
Administration for Children and Families, Children's Bureau and presented by
ICF International.

Today's Webinar is entitled, "Bridging the partner gap - best practices and working with the courts." And I am Joyce Rose, your host and moderator for today's Webinar. Next.

Due to changes in funding availability and priority, the opportunities for in person discussions and networking among professionals working on agency child welfare IT systems are limited.

As an alternative, the Division of State Systems within the Children's Bureau continues to provide a series of Webinars supporting information sharing and discussion.

The content of the Webinars are structured so as to appeal to state and tribal staff participating in an agency's child welfare IT initiative. And today, we would like to extend a warm welcome to those attending from the Court Improvement Program Listserv group. Next.

As I mentioned previously, today's Webinars is entitled, "Bridging the partner gap - best practices and working with the courts." In April, we will focus on the differences and benefits of QA and IV&V and as of now, we're planning on tackling the CMMI topics in May.

And then in June, we will dig into the many challenges of managing today's electronic workforce. Next. All attendees are encouraged participate in our Webinar with questions and comments. The participant lines are muted now but we will open them for the Q&A session at the end of the presentation.

However, please be aware that you can submit questions at any time using the Go to Webinar chat feature and they, too, will be addressed during the Q&A session.

Now, should we run out of time, we will respond to your questions via email and/or should you have additional questions, you may submit those to me at the email address listed on the slide - Joyce@Kassets.com.

Next. To help us identify topics that are of interest and benefit to all, it is important that we really do understand who is attending our Webinars. So we ask that you self-select one of the five categories listed and my colleague, Elizabeth, will conduct a poll. I would like to ask the CPI attendees to use the ACF Children's Bureau category. Elizabeth.

Elizabeth: Okay, Joyce, we have opened up the poll and if you could click on your screen and just self-select the category that best reflects your role. If there's a group of you participate together in a conference room, please let the role that represents the majority of your group.

And I'll go ahead and give you just a minute or two to finish the poll. It looks like only about 70% of you have responded, so if we could just get the last few people to go ahead and tell us who you are.

And just a couple more people. Go ahead and identify your role just by clicking on the dot right next to it. Okay, it looks like it's pretty much slowed down so I'm going to go ahead and close this out.

And so you can see today, it looks that we have 20% state child welfare information system project managers, 47%, our largest group, state child welfare information system program policy or technical staff.

Three percent of our audience today is tribal child welfare information system project managers. And the remaining 30%, ACF Children's Bureau personnel

or ACF contractors, and that would include our court improvement program folks for today as well.

Joyce Rose: Great. It's always encouraging to see that there is basically equal representation in attendance across different disciplines within an agency, so we are very appreciative of that. Thank you so very much.

Next please. So the format of today's Webinar is a brief introduction of our participants followed by about a 60 minute presentation. And then we'll end up with an attendee Q&A session followed by a short wrap up. And we really do encourage you to get involved in the Q&A sessions. Next please.

So I am extremely pleased to welcome our guest presenters from this State of Arkansas. So now let's meet them. Cecile Bluker who is the director of the Arkansas Department of Human Services, Division of Children and Family Services, has been looking forward to presenting but at the very last minute she's been called into a legislative session meeting.

So her staff, Nellena and Kate, will be doing the life-the heavy lifting for the presentation. So Nellena is the SACWIS manager for the Children's Reporting Information System, or, CRIS, for the Arkansas Department of Human Services, Office of Systems and Technology.

Nellena started with the CRIS project in 2000. And prior to becoming the manager in 2011, she was a systems coordination analyst, aka, business analyst.

During her time at CRIS, Nellena has performed many job duties including managing the CRIS staff while ensuring releases and federal reports are accurate and timely, helping users with questions, data corrections, providing

training, completing detailed systems analysis and design specs well working with contracts, development staff, testing new enhancements and defects for new releases - a day in the life of a SACWIS project manager for sure.

Nellena has also frontline staff experience working with the Division of Children and Family Services as a caseworker and she obtained her BS degree in psychology from the University of Central Arkansas.

Kate Shufeldt has been with the Arkansas Court Improvement Program since early 2014. She previously worked as a nonprofit management consultant in Indiana and there she conducted program evaluations, developed a branch proposals, coached boards of directors, facilitated strategic planning sessions, conducted trainings and assisted organizations in developing the programs.

Kate's previous experience also includes direct practice and administration at domestic violence organizations and grass roots organizing groups. Kate obtained both her BS and Masters in Social Work degrees from St. Louis University and, as well, she received a Masters of Public Affairs degree from Indiana University in South Bend. Next. So now, I would like to invite Kate to start the presentation. Kate.

Kate Shufeldt: All right. Good afternoon everyone. First we wanted to give you a little bit of historical perspective of kind of where the courts and DCFS started from before we began this project.

The courts in Arkansas are pretty new to electronic filing and record keeping. So directly before this, we had an Access database where data - or where the data was entered here locally.

So our attorneys out in the field would actually fax us orders and they would be entered here. So it was not incredibly timely. And before that, it was just all paper, okay. So that's kind of where we started from just a few years ago. Nellena.

Nellena Garrison: Good afternoon. For the DCFS records, the staff have access to our SACWIS system which is CRIS, Joyce mentioned. And they would enter the necessary court information into our court screens.

And then those involved with the courts do not have access to our SACWIS system so they would not have access to what type of court information was being entered by the workers. Next.

Kate Shufeldt: So whenever we were asked to present, I went back through some of the beginning documents for this project. And I was able to pull out the initial goals and guiding principles, which you'll see on the next slide, of DNET.

DNET is what we call the exchange here at the courts. The goals of DNET are essentially two enable information sharing between courts and DHS. It helps provide timely permanency measures out - sorry, permanency outcome data to both sides.

DNET allows for the production of court orders within this program. We're able to manage this information and keep it accurate throughout the case. And it also increases confidentiality and privacy since the documents don't have to be emailed or sent through other non-secure methods. Next slide please.

So some of the guiding principles of DNET, it doesn't change what information people have access to but how it is accessed. You know, we - on

our end, the attorneys ad litem and parent counsel already have access to certain information through DCFS and vice versa.

So it keeps what information they already have access to. Again, privacy and confidentiality, we do have strict login procedures and confidentiality measures to where only certain people can see certain items within our program.

We try to make DNET as user friendly as possible. Whoever owns the information is responsible for maintaining it. So if it's information about court hearings or orders, the court side maintains it.

If it's information about child demographics or removals, that's coming from DCFS. Okay, and DNET is not the official court record nor is it the official DHS record. It's really just a way for us to share information. Next slide please.

Nellena Garrison: And then the building of the exchange in DNET - we need not only input from the workers who would use the information but also from the technology people who would have to build it, so is it technologically possible?

There were several years of planning before we even started building the exchange. So overall it took about three years just to build DNET and the exchange took about another two years, so was a long process - about five years.

We started in later 2007. The information that was supposed to be stored in the statewide court system Context, so the Web based system, the end-users found it was not user-friendly so they decided to set up a separate system that could interface with Context.

It took about one year to go through the process and decide to do something separate. In 2009, they had focus groups of users and what they would like. They talked about common elements that would be good to share and focus group members were also the guinea pigs for testing it as it was being built.

They looked at the toolkit outcome measures such as timeliness of hearings and how to incorporate those and they look into having orders production done in the system.

In 2010, DNET went to live court end-users and then it took about six to seven months of analyzing and mapping between CRIS and DNET. The two sides needed to understand how each other's systems worked and how they were being used.

And we were able to do the development on the front end and what people see and how for DNET over nine months of phasing in, and then in the backend, joint development exchanges created with hired outside contractors.

Exchange went live in 2012 between the two systems and then there were built in reports and DNET that went live in 2012 as well. So, as you can see, like, it just took a long process to get started.

There was 8 resource issues about who was going to document what and just the sheer process of ensuring, you know, that it provides what's needed from people, to take that and technology and then the policy and legal concerns were addressed. Next.

Kate Shufeldt: Okay, so we tried to kind of diagram it out for everyone so the exchange is between CRIS and Context. Context is our statewide court management

system. Context was not seen as very user-friendly to our end-users and I think mainly because Context is so big that there are a lot of things in there that they weren't necessarily needing to use.

So with that, this concept for DNET was created, and DNET really is Context, they use the same tables, okay, but DNET is just a more user-friendly overlay of Context.

So court side end-users see DNET and then the DCFS end-users see their CRIS system. So we don't have access to each other's databases outright but we exchange information within them. Next slide please.

Nellena Garrison: The roles in building DNET, we had end-user input, attorneys, CASA, judges, DCFS workers and input. We wanted to ensure there was compliance of the court performance toolkit measures and compliance with SACWIS and AFCARS.

Some AFCARS elements that the data exchange addresses are element five, the date and most recent periodic review, and elements 47 and 48 which are the mother and father's date of TPR. So that information is exchanged with DNET and so that was - we wanted to ensure that we were meeting compliance there. Next.

Kate Shufeldt: Okay, so the actual exchange - DNET is Web-based for court users but, again, not for CRIS users. They don't actually see DNET. They just the information brought over from DNET.

The exchange occurs four times daily so whenever our end-users login, they should be seeing pretty up-to-date information. And placement information is actually an on-demand query.

So if an attorney looks at placement at 10:00 in the morning and then that afternoon, that child is moved, if they look at it again at 5:00, it'll have their new information. It'll be an on-demand query. Next slide please.

Nellena Garrison: The exchange of information from CRIS into DNET - so the CRIS system sends the removal information on clients that have removals and that starts the process of creating a case in DNET. And then that case stays in a pending status in the DNET system until an order is assigned giving – assigning – an attorney ad litem and a document number.

Then it creates – they – on the DNET side, it creates an actual case on DNET. But some of the information exchange are the child client demographics, their address and ICWA status, which the ICWA status is just if ICWA applies to the case, and there's very few in Arkansas.

We provide case name and county, parents and guardian's demographics, contact information, and relationship, the date and time of removal, the removal – removed from – information, DCFS staff assigned and contact information and placement information.

And it has coming soon, but we actually implemented that on - last Friday, 3/20. And some of the specifics on the placement information that we're providing is the current open placement of the DNET clients that we have an exchange with.

We provide the enter date and time, exit date and time, exit reason, the placement service type the child is that, the provider name, provider physical location address.

And we include all placements, from the current placement from there on after they're approved. There are certain things that parent counsel, on the DNET side cannot see, such as provider name and provider physical location address. And then also the exchange provides updates throughout the case. Next slide.

Kate Shufeldt: Okay, and then from the court side, the information that we send over to CRIS includes dates of orders, dates of hearings, our attorneys, judges and CASAs who are assigned to the case, along with their contact information, the docket number, if there's been previous court involvement with the same family, findings of hearings, case goals, court orders, admitted documents and shared documents, as well as updates dates throughout the case.

The court orders and other documents, they are three separate sections. We have a section specifically for court orders that are signed that have been filed and everything through the judge. And admitted documents are those that have just been submitted as evidence.

And then shared documents are documents that the staff on the case can share with each other. So we've been encouraging, for instance, CASA volunteers to upload their court reports into the shared documents as a way to share them with all of the staff on the case before the hearing. Next slide please.

So again, as far as access, with the exchange, the attorney ad litem, parent counsel, judges, DCFS family service workers, DCFS supervisors and central office staff, CASAs and some trial court assistants all have access to information, whether it be on DNET or through CRIS.

They all have access to the same data. As Nellena said, there are some restrictions. For instance, parent counsel is not allowed to have the address and name of placements and things like that. Next slide please.

Nellena Garrison: The benefits of DNET for DCFS - greater security of documents, ready access to court orders, admitted documents and documents shared prior to court. And this is a big one for DCFS. So the actual signed order is scanned and, though staff and CRIS can pull up the scanned order, and it's very beneficial for different units within DCFS such as the IV-E eligibility unit.

It's beneficial to review that for eligibility determination. Financial support unit for DCFS might have to look at it for judge's orders to pay something. They have to look at the order to make sure before they can pay for it.

For quality assurance reviews, sometimes the orders can be looked at to make sure that the orders are being followed throughout the case. We identify and have contact information for attorneys assigned to the case.

Easy tracking and review for reasonable efforts findings, easy access to the history of the case goal and concurrent goal findings, ready review of timeliness and outcomes of court hearings, compliance with federal expectations of sharing information, and build steps save time when not required to fax, email, copy and mail documents and notice of upcoming hearings.

It's also beneficial for the history of the case. You know, if there's turnover within the caseworker or who is assigned to the case and they can look at these court hearing information and the orders and know more about the case.

Yeah, it also helps with the duplicate data entry, preventing that. So if the information comes from DNET for the court hearing, then that saves the DCFS staff from having to enter the court hearing information because before,

the DNET and data exchange, as I mentioned earlier, the DCFS worker was responsible to enter their court hearing information.

But now that we have the exchange, then they should rely on, you know, coming over from DNET so I think staff are happy with that feature as well. I think that's it. Next slide.

Kate Shufeldt: Okay, benefits of the exchange for the courts - again, greater security of documents, tracking of the court performance measures including timeliness of hearings.

And this is big on the CIP end who do a lot of our reporting for performance measures. Ready access to DCFS and CASA contact people and assigned workers.

On DNET there is a calendar function that automatically populates with hearings. So once an upcoming hearing is entered, it goes right into their calendar that they see as soon as they login so they're able to kind of keep up with what's coming down the pipeline.

Compliance with federal expectations - so sharing information. Electronic storage of court orders, petitions and other court documents. Ready data on caseloads in court activities. You know, we're able to see exactly how many cases and kids our attorneys work with and how often they're in court as well.

Automatic transfer of demographic information about case participants, and the legal history of the case in the event of attorney turnover. So we get new attorneys are side, all of the previous orders and other information are already in the file in DNET for them. Next slide please.

Nellena Garrison: The recent success - sharing of the scanned copies of court orders, admitted documents and share documents between DNET and CRIS - this is a phased approach with clusters of counties over three month period.

So this started in October 2014. We started with seven pilot counties. Then in November, we added 26 more counties and then by February we were statewide which is 75 counties.

One of the reasons that we did the phased approach on this is because, one, testing low capacity of the DNET server because their other databases on the server. So we wanted to make sure with statewide hitting it, that it wouldn't slow down the server so much where it would affect other databases.

Another reason we did the phased approach is for testing of the workers, using it and making sure it works correctly and make sure they understand how to use it.

So what happens on this is in CRIS, our SACWIS system, on our court hearings screen, we have a link that says DCFS court documents. So those applicable staff that have access to it will click on this link and it will take them to a website that has the scanned PDF document that they can actually pull up to review or print as needed.

For access to this link, for DCFS, they have to be assigned primary workers or their supervisor or an open secondary worker or their supervisor and then also those centralized staff that we mentioned earlier that was identified such as eligibility units, the financial unit, the quality assurance unit, those staff also have access to these links to look at those orders, those admitted documents.

Another recent success that I mentioned earlier was the placement information and data exchange that we implemented last Friday. So this will be very beneficial for the DNET staff, the attorneys, to see the placement information of the children. And, again, it will be the current open placement and those thereafter. It'll build a history of their cases. Next.

Kate Shufeldt: All right. So from working on this project for several years between the two agencies, there've been quite a few lessons learned. First and foremost it's important for everyone to have clear expectations and for all parties to have equal buy-in.

You know, things like timelines, what is shared, what can be shared technologically and understanding each side's terminology is crucial. You know, I - just in this Webinar, since I'm with the court side and Nellena is on DCFS side, we use different terminology whenever we're explaining certain things.

Another one is to be adaptable. Things change. You know, one thing that we noticed is that obviously technology is outdated as soon as you put it into place. So being able to work with what you have and being willing to accept change is big part of working with other agencies.

For me, being a data person, the biggest thing that I've learned here is that the data is only as good as what is entered. You know, if people aren't entering their information or if they are not paying attention to what they're entering and accidentally entered the wrong date, you know, that affects our reporting whenever we have to pull information for timeliness reports.

If it's saying that a hearing was in March, but was actually in November or something, that changes our timelines for the reporting. Another thing is to try

to have dedicated people or resources for this project especially who is, you know, taking the lead or making decisions on it.

Over the course of the few years, there've been several people on both sides lived in part of this project. On the court side, we're lucky enough to have our own DNET analyst, our own developer who has been with this project from the get-go.

But on DCFS side, their contacts that we work with are also working on other projects so our timelines, whenever we're working on a section, don't necessarily add up the way that we want to.

But I think the biggest one is just to remember the bigger picture. You know, with different groups of people, different agencies, everybody wants what they want. You know, attorneys don't like entering data. You know, there's fighting about who can see what and how things are shared.

But being able to just take a step back and remember, like, why we're doing it and the fact that once it's completely in place in it'll be better for everyone was kind of the light at the end of the tunnel.

Nellena Garrison: Kate, I had a couple of things on this one as well.

Kate Shufeldt: Yes.

Nellena Garrison: Okay, and some of the other things on lessons learned from DCFS's point is, you know, to get - or equal buy-in from the get-go because from the very get-go, it was an issue of who controlled DNET, like who the decision makers were in the process, who takes the lead, such as the attorneys, the DCFS, the administrative offices of the courts.

So that was one of the issues as well. Duplication of information, I know that was one of our benefits to try to prevent that, but we still find sometimes on the CRIS side, even though it came from DNET, some staff might also enter the same hearing and it might be due to timely entry, training issues, not understanding that they no longer need to do that.

Also, when we planned from the early get-go, we thought we would have the data exchange and the Web site, the DNET court documents Web site, at the same time from the early on decision, but that didn't happen, so that kind of changed some of our plans. So just kind of planning for what may or may not happen. But those are some of the things from DCFS's point as well. Thanks.

Kate Shufeldt: Next slide please. So for our future plans, of course, the - it always makes you feel good. The top one is already checked off so go celebration. Placement information, like Nellena said, we just completed that.

We have plans for doing some reporting and automatic auditing. Now that, especially on the DNET, and now that it is used on a daily basis, there's a lot more eyes on it and a lot more information in it.

So we need to really just routinize a lot of our kind of auditing processes and quality assurance processes as well. We are looking at sharing case plans and court reports through DNET and this would be in the shared documents section in our DNET.

So that would be case plans and court reports coming from with the CRIS system into the exchange. And this year, we're doing a redesign of DNET so that way we can upgrade the software but also make it more mobile friendly.

So the exchange and everything is still taking place. We're really just giving DNET a facelift and making it more accessible to our attorneys who might have, you know, iPads or other tablets in the courtroom with them. All right, and next slide.

Joyce Rose: Well, this is Joyce and I want to thank Nellena and Kate for giving us this wonderful presentation on a collaborative effort between two agencies. We can now open the phone lines for the chat feature for our Webinar attendees for questions and answers with our presenters.

And I guess, before I turn it over to Elizabeth who will manage that, I have a question to kick us off. And that's could you speak to the types of processes that you used and the types of documents that resulted in those processes regarding data sharing agreements between the two agencies?

Kate Shufeldt: So we have been having essentially annual - mostly annual MOU updates because it is ever-changing and ever-evolving so we kind of come back once a year to make sure that we have a plan in place for, you know, like the last slide talking about future plans. That's all from the MOU. That's what we decided as a group that we wanted to try to work on over the next year.

Joyce Rose: Right. Thank you. Elizabeth.

Elizabeth: Okay, I'm going to turn it over to Sandy, our operator. Sandy, if you could let people know how to line up on the phones for questions.

Coordinator: Thank you. At this time, if you would like to ask a question, please press star and 1 on your touchtone telephone. Make sure your phone is unmuted and record your name. Once again, please press star 1 on your touchtone telephone. Please hold a moment for any questions.

Elizabeth: Okay, and while we're holding we did have a question they came in via the chat feature and it was very similar, I think, to what Joyce just asked which was where there any memoranda of understanding or other documents signed?

Kate Shufeldt: Yes, again, we have the MOU in place.

Elizabeth: Okay.

Coordinator: Once again, if you would like to ask a question over the phone lines, please press star and 1 on your touchtone telephone.

Joyce Rose: Well, while we're waiting for our attendees to submit questions and I guess I can – I will – ask another one. If you basically had a chance to do this all over again, what would you do differently?

Kate Shufeldt: That's a tough one.

Joyce Rose: This is not meant to stump the panel. I'm sorry.

Kate Shufeldt: So, I think I would probably reiterate something from the lessons learned about making sure that everyone has the same expectations. Throughout the course of the project, there was a lot of back and forth about who would enter information, what information was being shared, things like that.

And from the DNET end, it originally started as kind of a case management system for the attorney ad litem. That was the original plan. And now we have parent counsel, CASA, judges, every one of the court side on it. So how it was originally designed is now having to be rethought because we have different types of users on the DNET side now.

Joyce Rose: Interesting. Thank you.

Coordinator: I currently have no questions over the audio. Once again, if you'd like to ask a question, please press star and 1.

Elizabeth: Okay, and we do have a question that's come in via the chat box. Has there been enough time to see metrics on improvements and timeliness of hearings or other outcomes?

Kate Shufeldt: Yes, so I have started pulling some information about timeliness of hearings. And unfortunately we're not able to do a lot of comparison yet simply because it is still relatively new.

So trying to pull, you know, a year or half a year at a time, we're still in some growing pains as far as data quality and data checks. But that - I started looking at it but I wouldn't say that there has been any improvement or decline in hearing timeliness yet.

Joyce Rose: Elizabeth, do we have any more chat questions?

Elizabeth: We do. What kind of feedback are you getting from case managers on access to court data?

Kate Shufeldt: Nellena, do you want to take this one?

Nellena Garrison: Yes. Yes, I was about to say a lot of times, like you know, many things, is you only hear the not so good. So why usually here is about, like, have something with the data exchange, let's say, for court hearing information that maybe a

client was left out where the hearing date is different than what they think, you know, that they know it to be.

So a lot of times I hear things like that and so what I do with those is I get with the DNET staff. We kind of workout what, you know, the issue maybe. Maybe it was just, you know, entered incorrectly on the DNET side. And then they correct it and we get it corrected.

But I have heard some good feedback especially about the DNET court documents Web link that, you know, especially once they knew was out there, they were - I got a - you know, some people emailing and saying they were very excited about that feature and some of you get why can't I see the document link?

Because of you don't have the access to it, you won't see the link. So let's say you have a person that's not assigned to the case or that's a centralized user that was approved to have access. They might go to a certain case and want to see that but they don't have access so I get questions about that.

But, overall, I think it's a good - good feedback especially, you know, on the exchange they don't, they're not responsible any longer have to enter that information. You know, it should come from DNET and that's been out there is 2012. But this Web - the Web document link is a good, positive thing that we've heard.

Elizabeth: Okay, another question we have - regarding information exchanges, an issue that keeps leadership agencies going in circles is misunderstanding about data sharing policies that govern their respective operations.

How much time did it take your participating agencies to achieve a common understanding among prospective users about what can and cannot be shared? And I would add to that, what are some of the strategies they you can't be successful in achieving that common understanding?

Kate Shufeldt: So what – in Arkansas – what is accessible for our attorneys, and CASAs, and whatnot, are actually in the Arkansas code. It's legislated. So we have a pretty clear-cut view of what can be shared.

A lot of the back and forth has been how it is shared, whether it goes through the exchange, if it's still, you know, paper given to each other at the local level, things like that. But as far as what is shared, for us, that's legislated.

Elizabeth: Do we have any questions, Sandy, the phone?

Coordinator: At this time, I'm showing no audio questions.

Elizabeth: Okay. Next online then is, information reported to AFCARS involving court action and outcomes pulled from SACWIS, what relationship exists between CRIS and DNET from these types of data?

Kate Shufeldt: Nellena, do want to take that?

Nellena Garrison: Okay. So as mentioned, the elements that are beneficial for AFCARS from DNET information are element five, the date of most recent periodic review and then 47 and 48, the TPR dates for mother and father.

But yes, so the information on the data exchange comes from the DNET system into CRIS and into are applicable screens. And so with our logic that we pull AFCARS, we pull from our CRIS screens. So it's helpful that we get

court hearing information, we get TPR information and then we submit that data that comes from DNET for our AFCARS.

Elizabeth: Okay. And what kind of feedback have you gotten from your court and your legal staff?

Kate Shufeldt: Overall, pretty positive. Our attorneys tend to grumble whenever we asked them to enter data. But our judges, in the last few years, has become very data oriented so they are loving it because it does, you know, even just the sheer count of tracking for them, how many new cases they have within a certain time range, that was something that wasn't necessarily - that they weren't able to do beforehand because everything was on paper.

So being able to quickly pull up simple reports for them, they've really started to actually look at data and see what their numbers are like and see how long that their kids are staying in. And it's prompted some action in terms of bringing trainings in, trying out mediation in certain cases, things like that.

Joyce Rose: With the placement information, they haven't had enough time, have they, Kate, to analyze how beneficial that will be?

Kate Shufeldt: Right. No, the placement information is still very new but I think that they are going to go through the roof on that.

Elizabeth: Sandy, do we have any questions on the phone?

Coordinator: I'm showing no audio questions. Once again, if they'd like to ask a question, please press star 1.

Elizabeth: Okay. So from our chat feature, was there any single event or person that kicked this off or was it just kind of a good idea whose time had come?

Kate Shufeldt: So the project started because AOC had the CIP grant and it - what, you know, the two big players here are Connie Hickman Tanner at the AOC and Cecile Bluker at DCFS.

And once they were on board with it, then, you know, all of the staff fell in line. But, again, with the CIP data and technology grant, we're able to have the resources for an analyst who is here who just works on DNET. And that's really kind of what kept it going I think.

Elizabeth: Okay.

Joyce Rose: This is Joyce. I have a question about training. Did you have separate trainers or did you collaborate and train everyone on the two different systems?

Kate Shufeldt: So the training has been separate because, again, it is two different systems. DCFS workers are still using their CRIS system that they know and work with on a daily basis. It's just an additional screen in their system.

On the DNET end, we do regular trainings with our attorneys in CASA and judges if they want it, but especially with turnover, we do DNET trainings fairly regularly.

Joyce Rose: Thank you.

Nellena Garrison: On the CRIS side, we have - DCFS has a contract with Mid-South Academy through the University of Arkansas, Little Rock. And so they train our CRIS screens, and so they would, you know, discuss the DNET information.

And also I send out, like, for the DNET court documents links, I did a document and send it out to the staff and it's also in our CRIS net site so they can access it to learn more about how to access that Web link to get - look at the actual orders meta-documents.

Joyce Rose: Great. Thanks.

Elizabeth: Okay, so we have some more questions online, an AFCARS follow-up question. Placement removals and discharges and their court determination counterparts, have you either had you foresee any scenarios where those might fall out of sync?

Kate Shufeldt: Nellena?

Nellena Garrison: Sorry, can you repeat the question one more time to make sure I understand it?

Elizabeth: Okay. It's an AFCARS follow-up question. And it says placement removal and discharges and their court determination counterparts, have you had or can you for see any scenarios where they might fall out of sync?

Nellena Garrison: Not that I'm aware of or that I can foresee because our - well, unless something is entered incorrectly in our system, but our removal information starts the pending case in DNET so I guess that could be an instance.

I haven't seen one or heard of one but where they put the incorrect removal information that sent the DNET or discharge information because they also exit the child from our system, that doesn't match up with maybe what the court order said or discharge. But I haven't seen of any or heard of any that I know of.

Elizabeth: And next question, what other costs were there besides the CIP analyst?

Kate Shufeldt: So a lot of the cost was for a server. That was a lot of money. I can't remember exactly how much but that was a lot. There's also just a lot in time, literally staff time for going over the MOU for Nellena's staff to work on it.

Also whenever DNET was first being built, we had to hire outside contractors because it was such a large project that our one person on this side couldn't do it all, so the outside contractors did a lot of the programming as well.

Elizabeth: And, Sandy, do we have any questions on the phone?

Coordinator: We do have a question. Our next question comes from Missy Jeffers. Your line is open.

Missy Jeffers: Hi. I am just wondering - I know you mentioned that the shared documents are scanned, so is there a designated staff who does that or is that left up to, like, attorneys and et cetera?

Kate Shufeldt: It's - in addition to our DNET analyst, there is - I believe his title is DNET manager. But he works with our attorney program to help gather the orders and convert them into a PDF.

Elizabeth: Does that answer your question, Missy?

Missy Jeffers: Yes, thank you.

Elizabeth: Okay. Sandy, other questions on the phone?

Coordinator: I'm currently showing no further questions. Once again, if you'd like to ask a question, please press star 1.

Elizabeth: Okay, and from our chat feature, is the DNET system used to notify parties of hearings? And has DCF been able to show improved notification as a result of the exchange?

Kate Shufeldt: DNET is not currently used as an official notification procedure. That is a future goal we hope.

Elizabeth: Okay.

Nellena Garrison: In CRIS, we do get the next hearing information from DNET but, yes, it doesn't do any automated notifications.

Elizabeth: All right. Those are all the questions I have in the chat. So, Sandy, I'll do one last check of the phone.

Coordinator: At this time, I'm showing no further questions.

Elizabeth: Okay, Joyce, I'm going to go ahead and turn it over to you and you can wrap things up for us today.

Joyce Rose: All right. Well, I again want to thank Nellena and Kate for their excellent presentations. We certainly hope that the information shared with all of you today with both informative and valuable.

And I just want to take a second and thank you for your questions as they result in or create a bit more dialogue that expands the topics significantly. So

thank you for asking questions and for our presenters who very capably responded. And, again, thank you.

So as a reminder, please remember to register for the April Webinar which is the IV&V and QA topics. There will be an announcement release. So once that is released, please register.

And, additionally, if you have any questions regarding today's topic, would like more information about any of our scheduled Webinars or would like to volunteer your state as topic presenter, please do not hesitate to contact me at the email listed above. It's Joyce@Kassets.com.

Again, this Webinar has been recorded and will be made available online. When it is complete and post it, we will send a message via the SACWIS manager's Listserv with the link. Again, thank you very much. Goodbye.

Coordinator: Thank you. That does conclude today's conference call. Thank you for participating and you may disconnect your lines at this time.

END