

## **Family First - Programs and Service Array Workgroup (PSAWG)**

**Meeting Date: January 28, 2021 | 1:30 - 3:00 pm**

### **Meeting Summary**

#### **Welcome/Introductions:**

- Co-leads Elizabeth Duryea and Elisabeth Cannata welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the agenda.
- All PSAWG minutes are on the website and up to date.
- Elizabeth and Elisabeth presented PSAWG's set of initial recommendations to the Governance Committee earlier in January.
- The workgroup will discuss its workplan through April and begin updating/reviewing the models that have newly been added to the Clearinghouse.

#### **Desired Results**

- Share updates from Governance and next steps with other workgroups
- Discuss fluidity of Title IV-E Clearinghouse and ongoing EBP review
- Review newly added Tier 2 models for fit/feasibility to assess additions to our initial recommendations and work ahead with Fiscal Workgroup
- Discuss timeline for review process for Tier 3 and Tier 4 models and identified gaps

#### **Governance Updates**

- The Co-leads presented at the 1/5 Governance committee meeting. They shared the workgroup's initial recommendations and described the workgroup's process. They received lots of good feedback and expertise. They also outlined service gaps and next steps.
- PSAWG will still utilize small groups for portions of their work.
- The Co-leads are pleased to have diverse expertise represented within the workgroup.

#### **Workplan**

- The workgroup reviewed the timeline and process of what they have done so far.
- Throughout February, small workgroups will conduct analyses offline that will be shared with the workgroup at the next meeting on 2/25. The workplan after that meeting will depend on the workgroup's progress and what gaps may be left.
- The PSAWG Co-leads will present at the Fiscal workgroup's meeting on 2/4.
- A hybrid team including members of PSAWG and Fiscal will assess the considerations for Tier 2 models.
- PSAWG will check in with the full workgroup depending on its progress and what makes sense for everyone.

#### **FFPSA-Eligible EBPs**

- The FFPSA Clearinghouse has 4 levels designated depending on a program's recognized empirical support: well-supported; supported; promising; and not supported.
- Since creating our initial recommendations, many Tier 2 models have been added as supported or promising, where there are additional QI requirements for each - a review may be needed.

- We know that other models outside of those on the FFPSA Clearinghouse may be valuable and would like to consider those models.

### Selection Criteria

- The Fit and Feasibility Matrix will continue to guide much of our decision-making, as well as a continued focus on racial justice.
- The workgroup reviewed the summary of the EBPs they have recommended for further consideration.
- The workgroup looked at the new additions to the Clearinghouse and where they fit on the fit and feasibility matrix.
  - Under High Fit/Low Feasibility, the following were added:
    - Adolescent Community Reinforcement Approach (ACR-A)
    - Child-Parent Psychotherapy
    - Intercept
    - SafeCare
    - Sobriety Treatment and Recovery Teams
    - TRBI 101
    - Trust-Based Relational Intervention - Caregiver Training
    - Iowa Parent Partner Approach
      - NOTE - This is more of adjunctive, peer support service
  - Under Low Fit/Low Feasibility, the following were added:
    - Incredible Years - School Age Basic Program
    - Incredible Years - Toddler Basic Program
    - Interpersonal Psychotherapy
- The workgroup will look at these new models and consider places they overlap as well as the age range for these models. The co-leads reviewed each of the above models with the group (please see slide deck, slide 14-24).
- A workgroup member inquired whether there would be any additional funding on top of existing funds for ACR-A. There is no new money, and questions regarding funding streams and capacity will be addressed by Fiscal.
- Another question was, when these models were researched with communities of color, how do their outcomes compare with the outcomes for white children? This was an important point of clarification - although PSAWG is only endorsing models that have some evidence of research with diverse populations, that does not necessarily mean that the data analysis conducted in those studies provided comparisons of outcomes by race/ethnicity (for e.g., total sample sizes may not have been large enough to support comparison, or the researchers may not have looked at within group differences). Understanding the extent of data available about outcomes by race/ethnicity will require deeper analysis of the specific studies cited on the FFPSA Clearinghouse. We may also want to use Connecticut data to supplement what we know from other research.
- This was echoed by another participant; including people of color in a study does not necessarily mean that it is effective with that population. The co-leads confirmed that

we will dig deeper into this. We are limited by the models and what research is available, but we can look at our own data too to help answer these questions.

- The workgroup looked at the age continuum of recommended EBPs. There are many models that cover youth ages 0-5 and adolescents, whereas much fewer cover children in the middle of that age range and 18-21 year olds.
- These models will be analyzed in small workgroups offline as was done for prior model review to ensure we follow a consistent review process

### Discussion

- The previous models that were reviewed have much better-established networks in Connecticut.
- This is a dynamic review process; other models are in the queue, so the list we have reviewed is not final. There will be other opportunities to review models as more come on the list, although many were picked up in the last month.
- One person inquired about what race/ethnicity is available about TF-CBT - Elisabeth Cannata referenced a study conducted by the CT Child Health and Development Institute showing very strong outcomes for TF-CBT in Connecticut, looking specifically at outcomes by race and ethnicity and showing strong outcomes across the board, even reversing the disparities encountered by children of color when receiving treatment as usual.

### Remaining Gaps

- Housing
- Children and/or children with intellectual/developmental disabilities
- **Parents or caregivers with mental health disorders**
- Parents and caregivers with substance use disorders
- Families with IPV
- Children with incarcerated parents
- **Mental health needs of very young children**

### Next Steps

- On 2/4, the co-leads will present to the Fiscal workgroup.
- There will be work with Chapin Hall, Fiscal, and Governance to continue the analysis of Tier 1 and Tier 2 models.
- The workgroup will meet again on 2/25 to listen to updates, review the process to date, and consider Tier 3 models.
- The workgroup's engagement and input has been its strength. A deeper analysis will be due in March, and the hybrid group will help with this. To date, our breakout groups have been very helpful.
- As a reminder, there is no new money coming in; this is a repurposing of Title IV-E reimbursement funds. There are some myths regarding the financing around Family First, but the Fiscal workgroup will look at funding streams (both state and federal) and consider how we can leverage them to strengthen families.