

Panelists:

Mary Armstrong
Diane DePanfilis
Michelle Graef
Julie McCrae

Please note: The following is a direct transcription and has not been edited.

Julie McCrae: My name is Julie McCrae and I am with the Mountains and Plains Child Welfare Implementation Center and with the University of Denver, Butler Institute for Families. A couple of notes about the session. We have a 90-minute session here today and four panelists, so each of us will present some material for about 15 minutes each, and we'd like to hoard questions, significant questions until the end. If you have things for each panelist, we can take maybe one as we go, but, to keep us on track, we'll try to take most of the questions at the end.

Please note that the session is recorded and so when you start speaking you've consented to be recorded. And I think that's all the housekeeping that we need. We are going to talk today about developing a shared process measure for implementation projects in child welfare. Each of us is with one of the five Children's Bureau funded implementation centers across the country. And we have a nice distinguished panelists that's been working with the projects for several years. I'm the newest member of an evaluation team at the Mountains and Plains Child Welfare Implementation Center.

I am going to introduce the panelists and just do a couple of introductory slides and then Michelle Graef is going to take over and start describing the work that we've all been doing together. Michelle Graef, I'm going to introduce the panelists first. Michelle Graef is Associate Director of the Midwest Child Welfare Implementation Center and Faculty of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Center on Children Families and the Law. Her expertise is in training evaluation, job performance, turnover and case decision making.

Mary Armstrong will talk a little bit later on about development of the process measure. And she is Associate Professor at the University of South Florida, Department of Child and Family Studies and is with the Western and Pacific Child Welfare Implementation Center. And finally Diane DePanfilis is at the Atlantic Coast Child Welfare Implementation Center and she is Professor, Associate Dean for Research and Director of the Ruth Young Center for Families and Children at the University Of Maryland School Of Social Work. My goodness.

So, we have been working over the past few years to measure implementation using the National Implementation Research Network framework that was developed and written quite nicely about a few years ago from the University of South Florida and so all of the

implementation centers have been using this framework as a guide and the work that they do. So, knowing that we have multiple projects and that they vary substantially across the country, we still wanted to measure the process of implementation sites are going about their changes. So, we took that National Implementation Research Network framework and developed a measure across for all of us to use and we're going to that's what we're going to describe today. However, this was it's not just the four of us appear there is a very large team that was working on this and has contributed and collects data and looks at the data and reports it to their projects and some people that are not with the implementation center anymore, but, still contributing to the field and help develop the measure or Sarah Kaye, who is with the Atlantic Coast Child Welfare Implementation Center, Julie Morales, who is with MPCWIC, Mountains and Plains and a couple of other folks are here today, David Lambert and Jeff Chambers and Ryan Spohn from Northeast and Caribbean and the Midwest. So, we just wanted to acknowledge the other help that we that everyone has had in developing the measure and using it. So, the objectives of today's session is to provide an introduction of what the ICs are and the background and the background the measurement tool, describing how we expanded the implementation framework to apply to child welfare, our plans for developing in the measure further such as measurement consistency and developing common language and assessment, and how the measure is being used with other instruments at our sites to inform implementation and provide a few project examples. So, now I'm going to pass it on to Michelle and she'll take it from here.

Michelle Graef: I'm just going to say a few words about the context in which we're working. In 2008, the Children's Bureau embarked on what Jane Morgan has called a grand experiment and funded five cooperative agreements to establish Child Welfare Implementation Centers. We were conceptualized as a mechanism to provide in-depth long term training and technical assistance to states, territories, and tribes to assist them as they pursue sustainable systems change. I think the Children's Bureau recognized or saw a need for something like an implementation center again we're new and so it was sort of a I think a glimmer in someone's eye, but, they saw a need for something like that through their observations that states and tribes are often lacking the resources that are necessary to implement a comprehensive strategic plan.

And when I say resources, we're talking about really the broad spectrum of resources, so it could financial resources, it could be person power someone to kind of shepherd a project from start to finish. It could be technical assistance resources or all of the above. And so I think there was an identification of a need that you know to really do systems change right, there are resources that are lacking. And so the implementation centers are an experiment to try to infuse a state or a tribe at their request with those kinds of resources to see if that can make a difference in implementing systemic change.

So, this is the implementation center staff collectively I think we all have expertise in implementation strategies, systemic intervention, sort of how organization and systems change works. The way we do our work we issued a request for applications and states and tribes or jurisdictions responded with project proposals and we enter into mutually binding agreements for implementation projects to do in-depth long term projects with a

selected site. We're also charged with evaluating the implementation project. So, it's a very interesting opportunity there. We also provide peer networking opportunities for the states and tribes in our geographic region.

And here is a listing of our administrative homes for our implementation centers and we'll go down and read them all Julie has introduced us, but, I think there are some real heavy headers here in terms of universities and it's a really great group of colleagues. This map illustrates the geographic assignments that we have. Each implementation center is comprised of two ACF regions, and the diagonal stripes on the map illustrate the 25 locations where an implementation project is currently being conducted. So, really that's a pretty substantially swath of the country that's involved in an implementation project as we speak, kind of exciting. When the implementation centers first began, I'm not sure if any of us really or at least none of us here maybe Children's Bureau had a glimmer in their eye, but, I'm not sure if we all really truly had a sense of how many project applications we would get and what the scope or the kinds of projects that states and tribes would propose to do. So, it's been a really interesting journey. The jurisdictions proposed projects based on their needs and as I said it's resulted in a really interesting mix of the kinds of projects that are being supported. You see just a few examples of the types of projects here. Each project is in a minimum of two years and a maximum of 4. 5 years in duration and they are all of substantial budget. So, these are significant efforts that these jurisdictions are undergoing.

Having this diverse mix of projects to evaluate represents a really unique opportunity, but, it also represents some interesting challenges and I just want to briefly highlight some of those to give you context for what you're about to hear for the measure. Again there are 25 projects there in both public child welfare agencies, but, also tribal agencies. We have dedicated resources within the implementation centers to evaluate both the implementation of a project, but, also the intervention itself. So, these are really complex evaluations. The challenges are many. Some of the projects are really multiple projects all in one, multi-layered projects if you will. Some of them are focused on change at a real systems level. Others are focused on change at a more practice or project level. Some of the interventions are evidence based and some are not. Some of the projects are state wide. Some are regional or local even. So, there is a lot of variation that makes life really interesting here.

We also though have variation within the implementation centers. As Julie mentioned we all have come to this with maybe differing conceptual orientations for how we were looking at systems change and implementation. We're all free to propose our own methods and we all had different methodologies for collecting our process data when we first started, but, I think early on the Children's Bureau and our evaluator teams saw that there would be some common benefit in having some common measures across implementation centers so that we could have a lens for looking at all the projects that was standardized.

So, our charge was really to create and utilize some common measures both common process and maybe common capacity or outcome measures and what we're going to talk

about today is the common process measure that resulted. Finally, then our purpose here, if it's not already obvious, we sort of have a three-fold purpose in what we were doing with this piece that we're describing today, describing the timing sequence and duration of the implementation efforts that are going on across the country in a variety of different jurisdictions, secondly, to compare the patterns of implementation strategies by system or comparing them by outcome, comparing them by intervention, size, scope and what have you. And then ultimately, our desire is to try to inform theories of what it takes to successfully implement systems reforms in child welfare. And as we heard this morning, there is much work to be done there.

And I just want to mention that we have a few copies of a handout that lists all the implementation projects. There is also a display in the poster room when we finish here if you'd like to check that out, but, I have a few copies of this up here and at the end if you're interested in reading more about each of the projects, we can speak with you about that later. So, now Mary is going to speak about the actual project process measure and how that was developed.

Mary Armstrong: So, I think as it's clear and it's been well presented already that we had projects that were very, very different in scope and yet, we were all also committed to really building evidence and building knowledge about system change in child welfare. And we were in agreement about the need for using a common process measure. And so, when we, we were very fortunate I think as we began our implementation centers because at the same time, evidence was growing around what it takes to implement evidence-based practices and so we decided to really begin with the NIRN framework, that the National Implementation Research Network had used and we relied very heavily on their knowledge base and then we've also been learning from other folks like Enola Proctor and Greg Aarons who also have been doing great work in implementation science.

So, we're trying to take the best of what is already out there and that but still make it useful for these very diverse projects. So, what we have done we did organize the instrument basically around the NIRN framework. Many of you are probably already familiar with that framework and so we decided we weren't going to describe it in depth. If you just Google National Implementation Research Network they've got wonderful, wonderful resources on their website. But basically that framework describes implementation processes within drivers and that it also looks at key implementation activities that are assessed across stages. So, that's basically how the framework is organized.

And what we agreed to as a team with the Children's Bureau is that we would complete this new instrument that we were developing every six months, six months and we're actually we've also developed a Qualtrics data collection system where all of us are entering the data as we complete the measure every six months and all of us have access to that data system.

So, one of the advantages of the implementation drivers that NIRN has developed is that they really provide a framework for organizing the implementation projects that is

comprehensive integrated and compensatory. One of the things that we really like about the NIRN framework is that it does recognize that you can if you have weaknesses in certain areas, you can counterbalance so as we can assist by strengthening other implementation drivers. So, that's one of the values that we like about that framework and we've made use of. So, we did we have agreed that evaluating the progress of our implementation center projects as organized by the NIRN drivers is effective. One of the things that I have found we all have been I mean the other thing that we'll talk about a little bit later is that we're not all administering the instrument in exactly the same way and so I can talk a little bit about my own experience what I have done with the evaluation project that I am responsible for is that every six months I complete the instrument with the implementation center evaluate with the, not the evaluation team the operational team for that project and I really think that it kind of is a way every six months for us, for them as a project team to kind of step back and really assess where we are with each of these drivers and what we do for each of the drivers is we give at a salience rating which talks about how important and relevant has that driver been in the past six months and then we also give it an installation rating, how are we doing with installation of that driver.

So, what we've done here is up here are the NIRN stages as they have defined them, but, one of the things that we are very aware of being in the field and doing this with tribes and counties and states is that implementation is a process and it's not always linear and Karen and Jean the developers of NIRN recognized that too, but, we felt that we had to make some stages, some changes in the stages that really affect that reflect what we're doing, because as we've already pointed out, we've got very diverse projects both within our implementation centers and across our implementation centers and this non-linear movement is difficult to operationalize.

So, we've decided for our, we are, we are not putting as much emphasis on stages. So, our major focus is on the drivers of implementation and system change and at each of those six months data collection points, we make an overall assessment regarding what stage the project is at in implementation and then we actually focus on the drivers of change and the data that we're collecting reflects activities by driver and stage as they are occurring in practice. So, these are the implementation drivers that were developed by NIRN and I think everybody would really probably agree that this is what's all of these are so important for implementing system change. We have added some drivers and the ones that we have added are shared vision, values and mission, stakeholder engagement and cultural responsiveness.

As Michelle mentioned, we each came at this work of system change with slightly different theories of change and cultural responsiveness was something that was very central to my implementation center's theory of change right from the get-go and we have tribal projects. So, we have added these drivers. We've also changed the stages and we have added a design installation stage and we've also eliminated innovation. Innovation is really the final stage of the NIRN framework of their set of drivers and we all felt that probably in three or four, two or three or four years, we were not going to reach that stage of innovation. So, those are the changes that we've made to the drivers

and also to the stages. And these we believe that these changes that we've made speak to the challenges and opportunities that were facing us as evaluators with this task of trying to assess child welfare system change.

And then I'm just also going to describe a little bit to you about the tool and if any of you are interested in actually seeing the measure, of course, we will share it with you and if you just give us your card, at the end we'll be happy to email to you a copy of the measurement tool itself. So, the first section is just project demographics, a little bit about the scope, duration, focus of the change of the implementation project and then as I said before, we make a global decision around what implementation stage the project is at, at this point in time, every six months. And then as I've already mentioned, we are administering it in different ways, sometimes the evaluator fills it out. Sometimes the evaluator fills it out and then shares it with their project team. Sometimes the evaluator sits down with the project team every six months and fills it we fill it out together, so differences in the ways that we're administering it.

Part two is where we actually rate the implementation drivers and as I said before, we give a two ratings. The first is salience which is importance or the relevance of each of the 11 implementation drivers during this six months. And it's interesting. This may sound complex to you, but, it does not take that long one of the things we've realized is that Billy doesn't take long that launch to complete it. So, the first thing we're looking at is how important has this driver been over this past six months period and then we're also rating whether or not the installation of each of those drivers on a four-point scale, how much are we really focusing on the implementation of that driver.

The other thing that we've agreed to is as across all the implementation centers is that we're trying to take very detailed notes about the specific implementation activities that have happened during that six months, because part of what we're trying to build knowledge about and evidence is that as outsiders intervening and trying to actually deliver very intensive technical assistance to a state or tribe or community, what are the activities that we're doing to actually help them to implement system change, because that's a body of knowledge that wasn't really exist right now and so we're trying to build on that body of knowledge so we're trying to be very detailed about the specific implementation activities that are being used during those six months. So, and so at this point, I'm going to turn it over to Diane or Michelle and you're going to talk about fidelity and how we're actually trying to assess fidelity with the instrument.

Diane DePanfilis: Actually I think it turned out to be probably more of a focus on the measurement than fidelity and I'm way in a second, but, so one of the things that I think was the grand to goal when the development of this instrument sort of evolved is that we would be able to follow usual procedures for implementing assessments of the various psychometrics of this instrument, but, those of you who understand how instruments are validated also recognized the challenges with that grand idea in that we only have 26 projects. We have five sites that are using the instrument at six month intervals. So, the end is obviously quite small.

So, where we've begun is this, we started with face validity but we sort of came back to face validity which is how we also got to the modifications of the constructs that are being considered as well as the we made a change after the first iteration based on the sort of the practical use and then sort of the day-to-day use, things that were because even though the variability of the projects and the way that each of the implementation centers are structured is different. So, some of the way in which the measure is used varies a little bit. We all agree that we want it to be an accurate portrayal. So, we wanted to be a valid portrayal of what the implementation project is what implementation activities are most pertinent at that part of the process and then so that we will be able to compare those things across these 26 projects despite those variations. So, we also are trying to focus on least understanding and describing the differences and how the instruments used and it gets us closer to the notion that we have will increase consistency between the various ways that we all are using the instrument. So, we actually had an opportunity to meet face to face in June which was very helpful. I think it helped us move forward with trying to get agreement on the methods that we're choosing to actually use the instrument.

So, examples of other ways that we're measuring, the implementation process itself, I think come out in the data so that even though we agreed that the stages are not linear, there are certain types of measurement of implementation processes that are more relevant at exploration and initial implementation then they might be later on. So, you don't assess fidelity until you have installed your intervention for example. So, we've considered opportunities for being able to each use common measures of different components of the implementation activities in addition to just this process measure and we're hoping the process measures sort of helps us pull together those different sub-measurement strategies that are defining the measurement process.

So, examples that have been very relevant during exploration are needs assessments and readiness and organizational climate. And if state or tribe is intending to implement a new practice model, some analysis of the gaps in current services that led them to decide, they want to expand the focus or process of an implementation of a practice model. And in some cases, when the what is being implemented is articulated clearly enough, then we also are able to get to assessment of fidelity. And so one of the when we go the examples; one of the projects that I'll talk about is an example of a project where we are at assessment of fidelity.

So, we're going to give you two illustrations. The first illustration is one of the most comprehensive project, ACCWIC; the Atlantic Coast Child Welfare Implementation Center has six current implementation projects. The most comprehensiveness, comprehensive project that we have is a state wide implementation of a safety management implementation system in the State of West Virginia. Is anybody here from West Virginia? Hi. So, we might be able to have some real reflection of what some of this process is.

So, this is a as I said a statewide implementation of a very well specified systematic continuum of practice which includes safety assessment intervention decision-making

from the point the call comes in all the way through the decision around whether a child is unsafe, whether continuing services will be provided and then how they'll assess whether or not sufficient has occurred, control of the safety as well as change to eventually close the cases. The state was in their application for this project was determined to make a substantial difference in their performance on their CFSR child safety outcomes. Unique I think to this project is that from the get-go there was leadership buoyant at all stages of the organization from the commissioner along and a variety of different types of leadership teams have been put in place and actually have been using the drivers to guide their implementation process. So, we had an opportunity with the ACCWIC did a state forum last June and the West Virginia team had an opportunity to present the way in which each of those drivers have informed their implementation process. And that by the way that presentation is on the ACCWIC website, which is accwic.org if anybody wants to go. You just like to each of the projects and you can get a more specific description. So, you've already heard about the NIRN drivers. This slide I actually cut and pasted from the West Virginia presentation just to remind me to say that this was part of their guiding framework from when they began and has continued to sustain their commitment to having systems for focusing on one or more drivers at various stages as they've done. They've done a phase implementation even though it was statewide, it didn't go statewide. Today, it went in phases.

So, they implemented parts of the practice model in parts of the state, then they went on to the rest of the state and implemented those first two parts then they now they're at the stage where they're implementing the continuing services part of that intervention. So, as we were designing along with them and trying to collaborate about how we would tell the story about what the implementation effort look like, what implementation strategies did they use to support implementation of this comprehensive intervention system and also to build their own capacity to measure the what and the outcome over time, these were some of the evaluation activities that were implemented collaboratively with them.

Our over all of our evaluations are focused on sort of being individually tailored and collaboratively defined and they're part of a continuous feedback loop. And I think all of the implementation centers work this way also, so it isn't we don't like so to stand on the side and try to observe and document. We really are doing this collaboratively and feeding back incremental components of our assessment process with them, so that that information can be used to continually to guide that implementation process. So, in the West Virginia evaluation, it included many of the assessment processes that you see on this list.

But here is the specific way that the evaluation has been implemented in West Virginia. So, during the exploration stage, our purpose was primarily to inform their intervention development, their refinement of the intervention and then as we they move toward installation, the evaluation activities of try to focus on the implementation strategies that were being used, so the on the competency side of the drivers, the training and the coaching and the continuing support. And then as they have moved not quite, they're not quite to the full operation is where we actually see the testing of the intervention model itself. And we're going to move to another example and then we'll we definitely want to

come back to have the conversation about it overall ways in which these project evaluations have been considered.

Julie McCrae: Hi, I'm Julie again. And I'm going to talk about the Mountains and Plains Child Welfare Implementation Center evaluation and using the implementation process measure across our projects. As you know the Children's Bureau ICs started in 2008 I believe the awards were and most of the projects were starting in 2009 and so we are about in year two of the implementation process. For the Mountains and Plains Implementation Center, we have four projects to; we currently have four projects that start in 2009, two state level projects and two tribal projects. The two state projects are in Colorado and New Mexico and they are both implementing statewide practice models and in the tribal projects are in Oklahoma and North Dakota, the Osage Nation and three affiliated tribes in Turtle Mountain in North Dakota and they are also implementing tribal wide practice models that also have a data systems component to it.

So, those are the projects that we're looking at over time. So, just an overview of what we've been evaluating. Our design is a formative evaluation using mixed methods and a case study and so in the first year everybody was in exploration, I'll show you this on the next slide, but, our state projects were definitely in an exploration stage needing to gather information from other states regarding what practice models are, what fits for their state, getting their work teams together, figuring out their values, mission, those kinds of things. And so, during this phase in all of our projects we are and throughout the timeframe, we're doing process evaluation and we're doing organizational readiness assessment at the start that is based on a tool that's been out for a couple of years. That's just a 20-item measure something like that, but, the project work group that being functioning body uses this to as a program evaluation really tool to where they look at what they have in place, what they don't have in place and it's really meant to help them assess where they're at, at the start.

I won't go through all this, but, then as we get to where states and tribes are in implementation zones, it's a little bit more relevant for states because they have distinctive implementation zones or tribes are much smaller and so, it becomes a little, it doesn't fit quite as well, but, in both the state projects we have when we get to the stage of implementation zones, we've a readiness in current practices survey. We will look at training evaluation and training outcomes and then assess that over time in terms of fidelity of persons who are actually intended to make specific changes over time, because in some areas it's not the full agency. They're going to focus on investigations or they're going to focus on intake those kinds of things. And like I said we'll assess fidelity over time by 2012.

So, the implementation process measure, we've been administering every six months as everyone else has by conducting in a structured interview with our implementation specialist at each site. Our design has been to have it an implementation specialist be assigned to each project site that helps them with the technical assistance they need and guides them through a lot of the phases of the process. It's interesting though recently I think the implementation specialist in one of our sites has been feeling like they the birds

have flown off on their own. You know they're just they are no longer that site is not is no longer as reliable on the implementation specialist for designing their project or getting them through that. They've taken it and they're taking in the direction they want and continuing through the stages. So, that's a real positive. I think we've all learned is we've gone about this that the process of implementation is taking quite a while. And so we just outlined where our projects started in 2008-2009 when they applied to be in implementation center project. And you can see that the tribal projects started in a later implementation stage than our state projects and so at the end the tribal projects are also typically getting to a more full stage of implementation to where they've integrated the practice is becoming part of what they do and like I said the tribal projects have a data systems component. So, we hope to see that that's a daily part of their work in the tribe and they're using their new skills. With the state projects, they both started in early exploration phase and we conducted the process measure after one year and Colorado we rated as in an exploration or adoption phase and New Mexico in an early design phase to where they were looking at procedures, looking at human resource strategies, looking at training and getting a lot more specific about where they were going to go. Okay. So, as we looked across the projects, we definitely see now we have four, but, we'll have more in the future and we can look across all of our projects and I actually did look at all of the implementation process measure data that we had in our database at this point and it's amazing the similarity that we have across the country in what projects are doing and how far they are getting and the activities that they're engaging in to put this all into place. So, we have a lot of commonality.

And so, in our projects where they're going to get to seems appears to be so far definitely a function of where they started. So, if you have more in place, when you start you are going to progress a little more quickly towards the end. The tribal projects that we started with had more drivers initiated or already in place than the state projects at months six to 12 and at six to 12 months the tribal projects were in a training activity period and they were putting coaching components into place or as our state projects still are not at a training or coaching mentoring phase in their implementation zones.

At the six to 12 months stage, the state projects were focusing on leadership and consistent visible leadership with from what I can in observing this over the past year having a consistent message in the leader constantly being there and I'm talking about the you know state director and repeating the same mantra I think I've heard quite a few times and I *[Indiscernible]* *[00:41:20]* sitting here from Colorado and she could probably say what those communication pieces are like the pretty strongly have been throughout. So, they focused on leadership stakeholder engagement and communication across the state communication with community partners. They have pretty sophisticated communication plans that they're executing sometimes in collaboration with the National Resource Center and so, you know I think that this model coming out of an evidence-based practice framework where you're implementing the evidence-based practice typically in one agency.

This has turned out to be very different in a much from what I can tell a much larger component and level of importance when you're doing this in child welfare, because it's

these are large organizations and they have 60, you know 50 to 60 smaller components of that and we're working with two different types of systems where New Mexico, I'm talking about state projects, New Mexico is a state administered system and Colorado is a county administered system. So, but, in both situations communication has been a huge has taken a lot of time, thought and effort in this year that we're at right now. Inclusivity and decision-making, I think the projects have spent a lot of time on ensuring that you have multiple layers of your organization participating in the decision-making around components of your intervention. Across all of our four projects, there have been drivers that are having been installed at all yet, staff selection, facilitative administration, systems intervention and data systems and with the tribal projects, a component of their work was to develop a data system, but, I'm talking about data systems in place to evaluate their own practice. So, having a quality assurance practice in place things like that those drivers were not installed or partially in place. So, some major accomplishments of the Mountains and Plains Implementation work and this is really involves Maria Scannapieco, who's the Principal Investigator and her team at the University of Texas, Arlington and all the implementation specialists, but, all of the sites have practice models in place that have been wedded throughout their agency and they've got an input on those practice models. In the tribes, they have documented their business processes and documented them pretty intricately and have put into place data systems.

In New Mexico, I think there was a big focus or they took some proactive steps towards risk management and I know that on one of our calls recently others talked about that where change in administration was anticipated and there were pieces put into place to account for that before it occurred. And in Colorado, they have an implementation guide with a repeatable implementation strategy that they are taking, they'll start with their implementation zones and then when they expand to their next set of counties, they will repeat that and we will inform some of their, some of the work that they do in that regard so that when they take it to the next place hopefully, we will be providing information that's useful. And again I mentioned the communication plans.

So, I believe that all that we have you can check the websites of all of our implementation centers and we'll take questions.

Male Speaker 1: *[Indiscernible] [00:45:18] [00:45:24]*

Julie McCrae: Yeah.

Male Speaker 1: *[Indiscernible] [00:45:26] [00:45:28]*

Julie McCrae: We do. We have we do now. Yeah, we do. I think that the measure is in its very infancy. You know when you look at you know is it a quantitative measure, is it a process measure, you know what are we getting to. I think that we it is quantitative and we do have definitions, but, we have work to do around defining what is a partially in place driver, what is a fully in place driver and so, you know we just need to get more precise about that and that is the work that the evaluators group is currently doing and we'll make some progress on as we go, but, we can't really define those until we're until we've experienced it further, so.

Male Speaker 1: *[Indiscernible]* [00:46:15] [00:46:20]

Julie McCrae: Oh, sure yeah. Sure, and I mean I think the first place to look for the definition is...

Julie McCrae: NIRN.

Diane DePanfilis: Is in the NIRN information where that became the foundation for the work, so each of those are defined by NIRN based on research, the review of research about what activities made a difference with successful versus less successful implementation efforts. What we've had to do with 26 variations in the projects themselves is arrive at a definition that made sense for the various types of implementation strategies that were in place, but, I can tell you that that driver is key in all of our work and that you really do need to have it's sort of and there is the link between the facilitative administration and the data driven systems and then the performance assessment which some of us are at in terms of assessing fidelity, the degree to which the intervention or the change strategy is being implement as intended, all of those are interconnected. So, they support and supplement each other.

Just anecdotally on the data driven systems, I think many states are asking for not just in implementation centers are asking for more work around how to use data to drive top decisions. And that we're doing a partners meeting in September with each of our six project leadership and we're doing a session with them about that giving them illustrations from West Virginia and North Carolina on that driver and then getting all of the other projects to participate and consider how they might be in a better position to use data to drive their decision-making, so.

Male Speaker 1: *[Indiscernible]* [00:48:08] [00:48:14]

Julie McCrae: Well, I think...

Diane DePanfilis: Please thank you. Yeah.

Julie McCrae: Yeah, I think that the definitions work what's the adaptation is defining what they mean in child welfare.

Male Speaker 1: Yeah, yeah.

Julie McCrae: Right. I mean their common you know constructs.

Male Speaker 1: And then when you're ready, I mean you've got some terrific experience now be really interesting here you talk about the relationships between the drivers that interactive effect?

Julie McCrae: Yeah, yeah.

Female Speaker 1: I know you have 26 different projects, but, I wondered within that are you seeing any noticeable difference in progress through the drivers between state run and county run states.

Julie McCrae: I think that's a question for when we have the data all of the data across ICs.

Diane DePanfilis: Yeah, I wouldn't attribute that type of administration as much. It has more to do with what the scope of the project is. So, a statewide project might look different I would think for a county administered system and a state administered system, but, there is right now there are so many variables to be able to say one versus the other. It sort of depends on who is around the table with both types of state administered systems, who needs to be at the table in terms of that communication inclusion of all stakeholders to be part of that implementation process, yeah.

Female Speaker 2: Yeah, I guess I have a follow-up question related to tribes, then are you seeing how do you engage tribal councils, because they're at a different level than maybe the child welfare leadership in tribes and then how do you also work with change when there are political changes in those counsels in terms of the buoyant that you're talking about.

Mary Armstrong: Is there, well I guess I'm going to talk just about our experience with WPIC and as I said two of our projects are tribal and either directly or indirectly it is absolutely essential that we be working with the tribal counsels as well as the child welfare leaders within the tribes and I guess what I would say, what we're finding like in Alaska, where we're working both with the state child welfare agency as well as a consortium of 16, the 16-4b tribes is that leadership is important everywhere and we've had leadership changes everywhere. So, we've had changes at the state level in the child welfare administration. We've had changes in leadership at the tribal levels. We've also had changes in our own WPIC implementation team. So, we are trying to learn as much as we can around how you maneuver all of that and it's really challenging but we've got to take it on. I mean it's just something that we've got to understand better and build knowledge about.

I guess the other thing that this isn't exactly in response to your question, but, I was thinking when Diane was talking about building decision, data decision of worth systems, and how you do that with tribes and some of the challenges that we've come across is it's really interesting. So, the Alaska project is about reducing disproportionality among native Alaskan children and you know there is a wonderful body of literature about all this as a child goes through the child welfare system, their trajectory, the points at which disproportionality can take place. So, we've got. We know a lot on the one had about disproportionality and then you've got a group of tribes who and then we've also got this is really interesting, it turns out that the Office of Children's Services in Alaska has a wonderful secular system with great data.

So, it's like a ha, but, then we've got the tribes and they don't trust the data system, right. So, there is a lot of distrust there around making news of that driver. So, one of the so the strategies that we've been doing is that we built a data work group that is as much as possible led by the tribes. So, very active tribal involvement and then what we've been developing is a data dashboard on disproportionality and we've done it very, very slowly. I mean that's I mean we've talked already about how slow this happens, but, so we first of all had to agree, have agreement about the data indicators and that happened in our work group, it also happened in Alaska at our meetings we shared with on the state tribal Caucus which is a very important existing entity around state tribal relations and then for the first time six months ago we actually showed some data for the data dashboard, but, the goal is that data dashboard is going to be on the OCS website and it's going to be public and it's going to be by OCS region, so we can really look at differences and disproportionality across regions, but, every step of the way is like two steps forward, three steps back because of mistrust among the tribes and the state.

So, it's really been so fascinating and I guess the other part that all of us are trying to do through their process measure and all the other measures that people were showing you is how do we document what this process is like so that when we do this again, you know there is a body of knowledge that we're growing, I should stop talking, but, the other area. The other thing we're learning so much about is readiness. I mean Diane, you all have been talking about you know we all went through we thought you know really good readiness assessment with our projects. I mean these were competitive projects. So, implementation projects were competitively awarded.

So, we thought we understood ready, you know how and the states and the tribes thought they were ready, and they were not ready, right. I mean that was so great in the data that you showed Julie, so I think we're also learning so much about how you work with the tribe, how you work with a state system, how you work with the county system help them assess their own level of readiness and give them feedback about you know when they're ready and when they're not ready. So, I have said way too much, okay, oh my god.

Female Speaker 2: It's good.

Mary Armstrong: Okay.

Female Speaker 2: So interesting.

Jim: Mary you, hi.

Mary Armstrong: Hi Jim.

Jim: You spoke about how you administer the instrument with the implementation center.

Mary Armstrong: Yes.

Jim: Operational teams and my first question I'm curious about how the other evaluators are administering the instrument and the second part is I'm curious about whether you've all had any discussions regarding aggregating the data across 25 projects and whether there may be some implications depending on how the instrument is being administered in different ways.

Diane DePanfilis: I think at the meeting and maybe others can help me remember. I think we all agreed that the ultimate would be to have input never have one person do it and to especially because of anticipating who is going to be with you at the end when you're trying to put it all together and analyze it is to make sure that there was clear documentation, right. And so we all of us have a process of engaging, getting input from the implementation side and the evaluation side in completing it. And I think also documenting the new ones that aren't captured by just the quantitative salience rating or whatever and so that will have a all of that data using it, putting it in Qualtrics lends itself to being able to consolidate it. What we found we needed to do is go backwards though because we made we changed the instrument, so we're in sort of a catch-up mode to try to re-create what was known at those earlier stages since we, you know so. Yes, but, absolutely will that will be very interesting and we'll definitely be sharing.

Male Speaker 2: A follow-up first.

Mary Armstrong: Yeah.

Male Speaker 2: To the question and actually Diane you made this point in June when we met in St. Louis, we had really focused on sort of inter-rate reliability and just as Diane said, we're just having two different people from both the evaluation and the operational side going out, but, then we realized given our attempt to adapt this or contextualize the child welfare, we couldn't assume a way because the validity wasn't just the liability. So, we are really being revisiting these basic concepts to make sure we're just on track and I think that's part of the process that we've been doing.

Ryan Spohn: Just a second about what we do at Midwest. I think one of the things we agreed on as a group is we're going to force people to do everything exactly the same way because we interact with our states and tribes in different ways. We interact internally in our own organizations in different ways, so as we talked about different ways of collecting this data, and it kind of reflected what was existing, but, in Midwest I think what we one thing we're really focused on is to make this not just a data collection task, but, to make it useful for both our internal organization and for the states themselves. So, we've got some really strong feedback from at least I'd say half of our states of this and probably more than that. I think at some point all of our states said this is a very important time and place where we can all get on the same page. So, going through the we call it a quality report or quarterly report and that we do internally it puts all the state people and all of our own Midwest folk on the same page, where are we, in what places are we behind, in what places are we ahead, what's working well what isn't. So, this data collection technique, this process that we've developed is also it works for us very well internally.

And I think to the extent that we can keep it flexible, I think that's useful and then the fact that we have the numbers, we have more of a quantitative side to it that helps us to standardize it to a certain extent, but, then we also have the qualitative side which allows us to see the nuances and understand those better and both the implementation outcome tables that we've put together that your agency has helped work on, I think what you've done to help classify the projects together I think will be useful in helping us to reflect back on this data, the possibility of doing a meta analysis and trying to look at cluster the projects in that way I think as well when we have the data, we can continue to move forward and think about ways that the projects are similar and can be clustered and then we can go back and have that retrospective data and I think we can really improve our knowledge about these projects in that way.

Male Speaker 3: I'd be interested in talking to the implementation centers about what you're doing in your service gap analysis, because two of the resource centers developed a process and methodology for doing that particularly in trying to work that service array to improve specific outcomes or items in the CFSR.

Female Speaker 3: I want to question actually about and this is my question I think little bit but I was curious if the evaluation information is regularly shared with the localities from which are collecting it and if so what's their response to it?

Michelle Graef: I just want to...

Diane DePanfilis: Yeah.

Michelle Graef: Yeah, follow-up on what Ryan was saying because specifically about process evaluation at Midwest, this common measure, I'm going to just say sort of evolved from the process measure that we were using in many ways and we were doing it quarterly and then we moved to three times a year, but, it really is our project manager meets with the state folks and they go over the measure and it's basically driver by driver and looking at the work plan and logic model and saying what happened in this quarter, you know what have been the challenges, what have been the successes in documenting it. And it literally takes them like half a day to go through it, but, as Ryan said they just uniformly are all saying this is fabulous. It helps us stay on track. It gives us a lot of feedback and they kind of self assess and rate. You know well we haven't done everything that we said we were going to do and here is why and lets you know recommit to that.

So, we've just gotten phenomenally positive response about just this process measure, then we have the whole other I mean there is a whole another layer of what we're doing because we're evaluating our interventions and the outcomes that we're expecting and I know we all are and that's just a phenomenal effort to do that. We're that's still underway obviously, there is a lot going on there, but, the pieces where we've been able to package and give feedback to the state to inform their efforts, I think we've gotten really positive responses in there. I think they've been really grateful to have you know

Session 6.05 - Developing a Shared Process Measure for Implementation Projects in Child Welfare

someone available to give that feedback, because again that's a rarity I think for state effort. You know they don't always have that luxury of having that evaluation piece informing them as they're going along. So, that's been our experience.

Female Speaker 3: Does it include any evaluative component of the assistance being provided to them?

Michelle Graef: I think we're all some of all of us are doing.

Diane DePanfilis: Doing.

Michelle Graef: You know like.

Diane DePanfilis: Separate.

Michelle Graef: Ways of the implementation...

Diane DePanfilis: Right.

Michelle Graef: Center services.

Diane DePanfilis: Of the consumer's right.

Michelle Graef: Yeah, yeah.

Male Speaker 4: I got the question about somebody that was asking how well the implementation people were doing, so they sent people.

Diane DePanfilis: Yes.

Male Speaker 4: From somewhere, because I had to be interviewed.

Diane DePanfilis: From Maryland, yeah.

Michelle Graef: It might have also been from *[Indiscernible]* [01:03:22]

Male Speaker 4: It was for somebody that...

Diane DePanfilis: Oh, that's right, because West Virginia was one of the...

Michelle Graef: That's right, it could have been that too.

Diane DePanfilis: Case studies right, yeah.

Male Speaker 4: One thing West Virginia that's helped us you know the implementations go, is going as planned but those unforeseen barriers is...

Diane DePanfilis: Right.

Male Speaker 4: Not the implementation that has slowed us. It's working. For instance, we wanted the Family Functional Assessment on the front-end you know we've got it completely front-end CPSs and I know some people don't like front-end, back-end, but, you know back-end is being implemented, now the ongoing services, but, to move the function and family assessment from paper to put it in a SQL system we got into some dialogue between our MIS in-house department staff and the state-controlled OT office, because we lacked a number of scanners and the office to be able to get that stuff, we scanned into this SQL system and they're one to move to this Cloud Nine or Cloud something you know all these, so we have no control over some of that, so we did have to delay. We also really do technology issue when we moved some of the front-end to the web. We found out our equipment, couldn't handle it our bandwidth, our infrastructure, you know we had to back-off. We started in our largest office in right away. He was taking 20, 30 minutes now for SQL to come online because of bandwidth. So, you know there is some unforeseen things that causes to maybe back-off not stop implementation. We certainly have to delay some things and it wasn't because of the planning.

Michelle Graef: Right.

Male Speaker 4: It's just unforeseen issues that some of them out of our control.

Michelle Graef: But it's all part of the story that we want to document, right, exactly.

Male Speaker 5: Michelle I find it really interesting that you how you talked about how the implementation team and the implementation et cetera, and the client...

Michelle Graef: Right.

Male Speaker 5: Do that together.

Michelle Graef: Right.

Male Speaker 5: Do that and where we're in the same thing and its new business model, when we do the assessment which includes the readiness assessment and the work plan, we're doing it now with the state or the tribe, because number one just the consciousness is the reason. We get people thinking about stuff they may not have thought about.

Michelle Graef: Right, yeah.

Female Speaker 4: So, by using the drivers have you found any commonality among the 26 projects about which drivers are more key in terms of from that early exploration stage to that design of implementation stage?

Mary Armstrong: I think that's one of the questions we've been looking at.

Diane DePanfilis: I don't think any of us individually and since we haven't compiled to the data quests of 26 projects shared, I don't think any of us could directly answer that. Clearly, I think every state is a different place and that when they begin, so some drivers are going to be more important because others are sort of in place. And so I'm not sure exactly how we're going to sort of mark that, but, anyway. I mean West Virginia is a state that uses data and you've got your Green Mountain force where they bring folks together and they look at their own data and they get people engaged at all levels to discuss and consider what this means and what it might mean different in terms of their practice that many states are asking or wanting to do something that's like that.

Male Speaker 6: Georgia.

Diane DePanfilis: Right.

Male Speaker 6: G-force.

Diane DePanfilis: Right, yeah, yeah.

Michelle Graef: I just, just an observation on the drivers and this again this is just anecdotal I think there are some that are more usual suspects in child welfare like training you know that's the answer to everything is let's do training. We're trying to prevent that, but, I think we see a lot of you know where we got this training and that training on facilitative administration. We see a lot used in our projects, because there is it's you know policy, procedures, rules, you know job descriptions having the things in place that support the intervented, the one that at least in our four projects that I'm not seeing a lot of is the staff selection.

Diane DePanfilis: Oh yeah.

Michelle Graef: But I am the first person that would say that is probably one of the most critical drivers, but, it's not the one that people are it's not the one, it's not easy because of you know civil service rules or whatever and it just requires more time to get in place I think it's critical, but, it's not one that's been immediately targeted in some of our work plans not to say that it won't be, but, it is, does that seem fair to say?

Diane DePanfilis: Yeah, I mean I think it's hard.

Michelle Graef: It's not the one that they're going for first.

Diane DePanfilis: I mean states and organizations have who they have.

Michelle Graef: Yeah.

Diane DePanfilis: So, part of how we've seen it adjusted to is that sort of the needs assessment and what training needs people have might vary based on the level of

competence that is or assessed at the sort of the startup, but, it doesn't necessarily deal with attitudes. If I don't believe my purpose in life in child welfare is consistent with whatever the new practice model it is, it doesn't mean that the organization has the ability to ask that person to leave. I mean not it's so there is that sort of gap.

Michelle Graef: To the long term sustainability you're going to want to change the selection system so that...

Diane DePanfilis: Right.

Michelle Graef: You're ingraining those knowledge, skills and abilities, but, the right upfront part of the implementation that's not the first thing they're tackling. It's usually you know...

Diane DePanfilis: Right.

Michelle Graef: Training and policies, so.

Male Speaker 4: Well, to mention that West Virginia on a different front not part of our with ACCWIC, we are addressing the hiring process and we start with you know it escapes me now the name, but, it's from Texas, we've done a self assessment of 2600 employees each employee rather that want to have a self assessment it was a battery of couple different tests and it was brought together. We're selecting now what's a good child welfare worker.

Michelle Graef: You're right.

Male Speaker 4: A CPS worker and eventually we're working with our personnel, state personnel to incorporate that into the hiring process.

Michelle Graef: Great.

Male Speaker 4: It won't be the entire selection. We're concerned about more about how to get supervisors understand how to use what they say to help them select and make it like 25, 30, no more 30% of the scoring when you're trying to get a best fit best candidate.

Michelle Graef: It's right.

Male Speaker 4: Yeah, now that will work except when you get a place something like West Virginia or the same person shows up on a register every time, you just need a body then that assessment thing you go out to win and you put a body in there.

Male Speaker 5: I've got a question that kind of follows up on Lily Anna, so I'm wondering if you could articulate what the evaluation questions are that you feel like the instrument might help you answer and then also we're starting to get to some of the

hypothesis that it sounds like you have going in and I'm wondering whether there are additional hypothesis that you have that you feel like you might be able to be answering with the instrument once you do have the data?

Diane DePanfilis: Do we have a slide in the beginning?

Michelle Graef: Do we have a slide?

Julie McCrae: We could. We possibly do.

Diane DePanfilis: Yeah, I'll start talking while we go back. I thought we one of our slides focused on this, but, we want to understand what stage projects are in the various points in time in their process, so we want to understand what drivers are most important and then what implementation strategies are most important to support the drivers and or the stage at that during that interval.

Male Speaker 5: And I'm recalling that you guys also mentioned that one of the reasons that you liked the NIRN models that it's integrated and compensatory its approach to the different drivers, so following on those, what following those questions and the integrated and compensatory piece, what are some of the hypothesis that you have going in about that?

Diane DePanfilis: I have my personal ones, but, I don't know if I should but since we haven't discussed them, I don't think as a group.

Michelle Graef: Do you have something that you want to share with.

Ryan Spohn: Only thing about leadership and excluding the...

Diane DePanfilis: So, I think we've talked, go ahead Ryan.

Michelle Graef: Okay, do that. There you go, do that.

Ryan Spohn: Well, just again kind of anecdotal evidence we found in at least one of our projects that it seems like if leadership is motivated enough and charismatic enough that there is a lot of compensation that can occur to take off other drivers and we're kind of joking, so we had we presented this in other meeting and had a very and had an animated PowerPoint. So, I had to do so, but, you know as far as hypothesis, we might look at moving forward, you know for me it's kind of necessary and sufficient. Those are the kind of some of the ideas that are going to my head of these drivers. These are there things that we can just roll out as such as to have selection that this is something that in many instances other than positions that we are creating with the project itself that those aren't generally under the jurisdiction of an IC project and so maybe that's now where we should focus our energies and if the drivers are compensatory can we focus our energies in other places. So, I don't have any you know research hypothesis that I could say. This is what we're looking at per se, but, I always think of that that necessary and sufficient as

far as are there drivers that are absolutely necessary or not or are there drivers such as leadership that might be sufficient when we have deficits in other drivers.

Male Speaker 6: And also I guess the follow up in Ryan, I assume what Diane is going to say is in the session we were going to do yesterday that got down, hurricane doubt I guess.

Diane DePanfilis: Which you will now present.

Male Speaker 6: That's a verb. I cannot do a verb. It was actually a parallel for this effort where we're going to be reporting on Northeast and Caribbean's work and drivers just with some of our states, but, in a parallel fashion and given little bit more subjective I guess depiction of what we were finding out with drivers both from our evaluation as well as from the point of view of two of the states that we're working with New Hampshire, New Jersey. And one of the things that we found there is I guess in our ICs projects is that leadership is really a very important driver and was some self evident, but, that leadership at all levels, both executive leadership and commissioner and you know even governor staff, but, also from the middle level of the agency as well as sometimes from the field and that they need to go actually in both directions and that was a thing I think probably surprised us a bit. We knew yes it's important, but, not only it is important, but, it actually interacts with a lot of the other drivers.

Michelle Graef: I just want to say that with the staff selection, I'm just wondering if a more appropriate way to look at it would be levels of say Diane was touching on buoyant according to individuals level, buoyant and developing or capitalizing on those models that are out there, management where you know you have a champion in your unit, but, you also have some people who aren't going to come unless they're dragged to it. So rather than staff selection or that's not as applicable to child welfare because we have and we have. It's more around mobilizing some of those management strategies that we'll be able to penetrate all of your staff so that everybody is engaging in the new effort is one way to work that and that's relevant to child welfare.

Female Speaker 5: *[Indiscernible]* [01:15:15] ACCWIC to think of other question about hypothesis what interesting thing to me is this measurement is so mixed methods measurement, so we have quantitative and qualitative questions, so one thing when we combine our data, we couldn't look at it, say we several stages there are different drivers are important at different stages may be possible and look at that and also since we're making notes, why are these drivers important at this time and what are the strategies or barriers the strategy you used to overcome those barriers along the process, so making yourself those qualitative notes, we can understand why this is important and how people go about it.

Julie McCrae: Okay, just a couple more, we've about 10 more minutes.

Male Speaker 4: Real quick on data. We're using Cognos. Our SQL system is like three, whatever it's like one of the top things you can get in the SQL system so there is a

lot of stuff in there. We just never knew how to get it out. With Cognos we can get it out now. My commissioner can sit in his desk and he can look, he has even got to report that shows who is not using at, at all levels of management. And guess what there were some levels of management several months ago that had never looked at this stuff although they were supposed to.

Michelle Graef: Yeah.

Male Speaker 4: Guess what they're now looking at it, because he can sit in his desk and see all the way down. He can sit in his desk and look clear down to a worker in a unit in any part of the state of West Virginia whenever we got the little green, yellow, red, you know when you're bordering you're going from green to yellow, you know especially if you're going the wrong direction, he can go clear down to the level to say in a unit of five people who is not the one, at least who is not documenting it, sometimes that's what's the case and in the SQL system, so that has helped make a difference too is using that in the offices the different units you post this data, you talk about it in your meetings and they start saying you know well, we're a green unit, but, you're you know and people start wanting to be a green unit. They don't want to be the red unit in the office anymore. Before, nobody knew they were the red unit. We knew somebody was in red unit out there, but, we want to show who, well now know.

Michelle Graef: It sounds awful.

Male Speaker 4: Well, green and also he has cadence calls every week with the regional directors who in turn an hour before he has his cadence call with him, they have a cadence call now with their CSMs, Community Service Managers, because he said when I get on a phone with the regional directors, I don't want you telling me well we'll go find out why that's like it. You know better because they have advance notice of what they're going to be talking about. I want to know them. No, tell me, you're going to go away and find out. So, guess what they got to do. They got to find out and then you know just cascades one down. So, it's made a big difference being able to take that data, having dashboards, whatever the different needs are and to see it, that's made a big difference.

Female Speaker 6: It was a when you were talking about the readiness assessment I was curious what the readiness assessment tailed especially since your concerns that perhaps many of the localities were not quite ready for what they were proposing.

Diane DePanfilis: I don't know I mean I think we have a measure of readiness that looks at you know first of all what you know about it, about the it, about what's being implemented and what, how, what's your view of the resources that your agencies has to implement, what you believe is about to be implemented and then their personal salience or competence to implement as well as the perception that the leadership is going to provide the supports and resources that, so it's a multi-dimensional considers most of the constructs, but, that is at one point in time. And so sometimes having just done this in another jurisdiction outside of the implementation centers, sometimes what people don't

know is why they think they're readier than they may really be when the ground, when you actually hit the ground.

So, I think these are the kind of assessment that can inform. It can inform sort of a communication plan if people don't know enough or don't have an accurate picture, but, it also needs to be done routinely throughout not just at one point in time at the beginning. Because I think you might think you're ready, but, that's partly because you don't know what is going to take to do it and so I think that those kind of assessments happen on an ongoing basis. Yeah. And I think both IC evaluators and the Resource Center evaluators have recently shared a collection of different measures that have been used for assessing, am I right about that organizational climate as well as readiness assessments and that's been a benefit I think of this collaboration. Yeah.

Ryan Spohn: I was just going to say ask us after 6:00 PM tomorrow and we'll have that answered for you perhaps. Right, right. We at this time we don't have a universal readiness assessment instrument that we're using across all ICs, across all projects, but, that is something that we're looking at moving in that direction both with the ICs and the NRCs and we're going to start having talks about that to put everybody on the same page when you're going into work in these jurisdictions. We don't have to reinvent the real instrument.

Julie McCrae: I think we are learning that we at least at MPCWIC we are having at least two levels of readiness assessment, one at the agency level, so are there infrastructure supports in place at the outset and then how much do they change at the end of the project. We're going to do that. But then also with the individual level when you get to, when projects get to implementation zones or the people that you're specifically wanting to do new practices assessing where they are in terms of...

Diane DePanfilis: Right.

Julie McCrae: How much they value the practice, how much it fits with what they already do, how much risk is involved, but, we're currently Colorado is going to go through their implementation zone readiness survey just as we get all those email addresses.

Female Speaker 7: Are you pertinent to any issues with the state pushing back from assessment overload?

Diane DePanfilis: Yes. I have and partly it's because Maryland is unique in that we have multiple research and evaluations partnerships with the State of Maryland. So, when they propose to do this, the engagement implementation project, they wanted us to use as many components of our existing data collection efforts as possible. So, you don't want to send out a survey from this evaluation of implementation of family center practice in Maryland at the same time you're sending out. So, what we've done is this elaborate matrix where we've sort of cross-locked each of the elements that are being collected and win and then recently have looked at what added things need to be done. And one of

their goals is that they'll have the capacity to sustain using data to drive their understanding of how well you can engage from policy systems practice down and then what if any differences making in their outcomes. They want to have that sustained not only through their own capacity, but, through these other collaborative partnerships, so. But, partly with their committing too when they make that request for being an implementation center project is that they know that this collaborative evaluation is part of what they're asking for. They want to understand how well they do it, how well they implement it as well as what if any better people are as a result of the implementation, so.

Julie McCrae: Thank you everyone and we encourage you to contact any of us for further information or go into our website. You've been a great group to discuss this all with.