

SERVICE PARTNERSHIP FOR CHILDREN OF HIGH CONFLICT FAMILIES

Meeting #2, March 27, 2007

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION TO FACILITATION AND COLLABORATION

Project Director, Isabel Perez-Morina welcomed everyone back for the second meeting of the Service Partnership for Children of High Conflict Families. She announced that, in consultation, with the Partnership Facilitator, Janice Fleischer, a decision was made to extend the meeting times, beginning with meeting #3 in April, an extra hour. Meetings will begin at 8:30am (Registration and sign in at 8:00am) and end at 12:30pm. She expressed her hope that this would not cause a problem for Partner Members and will allow the Members to accomplish more at each meeting. The contract for deliverables to the funder is very tight in this phase of the Partnership and much must be done by October 1, 2007 which needs Member input.

Ms. Perez-Morina and Assistant Project Director, Belinda Paulicin, went on to announce that a contest was being held for a logo design, children from the domestic violence shelters are the participants. An invitation to participate was extended to the domestic violence shelters in Miami-Dade County. Miami-Dade County Advocate for Victims and The Lodge are both participating. The first place winning entry will be adopted as the official logo for the Service Partnership. Winners and participants will receive prizes.

Ms. Perez-Morina then introduced the Partnership Facilitator, Janice M. Fleischer, J.D., FLASH Resolutions, to the group. Ms. Fleischer was not at the first meeting of the Partnership due to a conflict in her schedule, but would be designing the process and leading the future meetings of the Partnership. (More information on Ms. Fleischer and FLASH Resolutions can be found at www.flashresolutions.com)

Ms. Fleischer thanked Ms. Perez-Morina and expressed her thanks for being asked to assist this group. She then reviewed the day's Agenda (Exhibit A). Ms. Fleischer reviewed the contents of the meeting packets, including a discussion of her role as a facilitator (Exhibit B) and Members' roles as participants (Exhibit C) in a collaborative endeavor. She explained the advantages of a collaborative process (Exhibit D) and announced that in the future, the Members would be asked to agree on a decision-making process for their deliberations.

Ms. Fleischer then directed Members' attention to a flipchart located in the room that had "Idea Parking Lot" as its heading. This is for Members who wish to do so, to make any comments or suggestions during a meeting. All comments written on this pad will be incorporated in the Reports of Proceedings of each meeting. She explained that the Reports of Proceedings are not "minutes" in that they do not attempt to capture everything that is said and by whom at each meeting. Rather, they are an explanation of what was done at the meeting and the outcome of any exercises and presentations. All Reports and their exhibits will be found subsequent to each meeting on the FLASH website at www.flashresolutions.com.

Ms. Fleischer also explained the Comment Cards which were included in every Members' packet. This card is used by members wishing to have specific comments incorporated into the Reports. Their comments may be anonymous or they may indicate their names. If a name is indicated on the comment card it will appear in the Report. She introduced the Members to the Evaluation

form also included in their packets (Exhibit E) and explained that this is for her use and the use of the Partnership staff to get a “pulse” on how the meetings are going and to assist Ms. Fleischer in improving her ability to assist them by knowing how they evaluate the meetings.

As a last explanation of administrative items, Ms. Fleischer indicated that she would be using a computer and projector to capture Member comments and the flow of the meetings. She asked that Members keep a close watch on what she types and correct her immediately if she does not capture member thoughts correctly or incorrectly reports on an item.

As a final piece of work for the Members, Ms. Fleischer introduced the Meeting Guidelines (Exhibit F) and asked if anyone had any additions or wanted anything deleted. There were no objections to adopting the Guidelines as drafted.

LETTER OF AGREEMENT AND GOVERNANCE POLICY-OVERVIEW

Ms. Perez-Morina explained that the funder of this Partnership requires that Members indicate their commitment to the Partnership through a written statement. Ms. Perez-Morina and Ms. Paulicin introduced a draft Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) (Exhibit G) for Members’ consideration and asked each Member to take it back to their organization/entity and get comments in by next Tuesday, April 3, 2007. The document will then be revised to meet the needs of all Member organizations/entities and will be sent out again before the April meeting. All Members must have signed this MOU prior to the April, 2007 meeting in order to continue to as a Partner and sit at the table to deliberate and provide input. Additionally, the contract deliverables require the Advocate Program to complete a “Governance Document” by May 15, 2007 which is prior to the Partnership May meeting. Ms. Perez-Morina provided Members with a draft Governance Document for their review and comment (Exhibit H); input on this document should be sent to Ms. Perez-Morina or Ms. Paulicin by April 3rd, the document would then be revised and sent out again to Members for their review prior to the next meeting. Further input would be solicited at the April, 2007 meeting.

Member comments regarding these documents:

1. How does it work if a Department has more than one representative?
 - a. Only one MOU is needed
 - b. Attach names of all representatives from that entity
 - c. 3 agencies that do not need them because they are signatories to the contract with the Children’s Trust (Funder):
 - i. The Eleventh Judicial Circuit/AOC
 - ii. American Therapeutic Corp.
 - iii. Children’s Home Society

The group took a short break.

CURRENT CATEGORIES- GOAL STATEMENTS

Upon returning from break, Ms. Fleischer explained the concept of planning strategically and directed Members to their packets for a definition of an “issue” and a “goal” (Exhibit I). She reminded Members that they had generated a list of issues at their first meeting. (See Meeting Report, February, 2007 Meeting #1). At this meeting, the first task would be for Members to develop goal “statements” for the three main goal themes of *shelters*, *courts* and *first response*. In order to make this exercise a bit easier, Ms. Perez-Morina and Ms. Paulicin drafted goal statements for the Members to consider and edit as they saw fit. Ms. Fleischer explained that this is called a “strawman” and is just a first attempt to put “pen to paper” for the group to consider. The three draft statements were:

SHELTER-

All children coming in contact with shelters will have access to appropriate and comprehensive services during their stay and upon exiting the shelter.

COURT-

All children of high conflict families will be identified early and referred for appropriate comprehensive services by employing a uniform screening process in the Eleventh Judicial Circuit of Florida.

FIRST RESPONSE -

All children exposed to violence will be identified and referred for appropriate comprehensive services by employing a uniform screening and response model for domestic violence incidents witnessed by children.

Members were asked to consider and discuss these drafts one at a time. Ms. Fleischer explained that then the Members would be asked to “wordsmith” these drafts and adopt goal statements. In order to memorialize the adoption of the statements, a decision making process was suggested by the Facilitator, that of consensus. She explained a consensus based method for adopting the Guidelines. Once a draft seemed to be getting close to acceptance in discussion, Ms. Fleischer will ask Members to indicate their approval by a show of hands that would indicate the following scale:

- o 5 fingers means wholehearted support
- o 4 fingers means support
- o 3 fingers means neutral but will support fully to outside world
- o 2 fingers means you still have questions you need to ask
- o 1 finger blocks any decision (no middle fingers!!)

If the ranking has all indications of “3” or above, consensus is reached.

What follows below is a transcript of the final adopted statements and their rankings along with the discussion elements as captured by the Facilitator.

SHELTER-

***DRAFT STATEMENT FOR DISCUSSION:** All children coming in contact with shelters will have access to appropriate and comprehensive services during their stay and upon exiting the shelter.*

Member Comments:

1. Don't like “upon exiting the shelter”, reflects Post shelter residency
2. Concern about the kind of services the kids need
3. May not need to be in goal statement
4. Defining the term “coming in contact” more clearly
5. A little more specificity, what is “coming into contact” what is “appropriate” what is timeframe
6. “coming in contact” with shelters needs more fleshing out
7. Need for follow up
8. Screening or assessment is needed; maybe mentioned in sentence
9. Maybe “when children are admitted or evaluated” to determine
10. Language on appropriateness of shelter itself; like “safe”
11. Can we incorporate how we help families as a unit
 - a. Part of the wrap around system will be to employ children and their families
12. Is there any assumption that there is a continuum of care and look for an alternative to shelters
 - a. With this grant, there is a limit to what we can accomplish at this time
 - b. The shelter can be a positive and correct place so we can discuss how we expand on this in the ultimate plan

13. Are we talking about all shelters? Homeless, DV (domestic violence) shelters, etc.
 - a. We need to start with domestic violence shelters for now
 - b. The money is not limitless; for now we need to consider only DV centers
 - c. Service dollars need to be attached for Homeless shelters
14. "All children referred to placement"
15. We are really limited in this first phase of this grant; it is a planning grant and implementation; we will go off the areas we can not go after them now.

FINAL: *All children and families in contact with domestic violence shelters will have access to appropriate and comprehensive services.*

5	4	3	2	1
0	25	9	0	0

Consensus achieved.

COURT-

DRAFT STATEMENT FOR DISCUSSION: *All children of high conflict families will be identified early and referred for appropriate comprehensive services by employing a uniform screening process in the Eleventh Judicial Circuit of Florida.*

Member Comments:

1. I have an issue; we cannot obligate a victim (mother or father); if Mom doesn't get the help how is Mom going to help the child? Victim needs to have services identified
2. Maybe add "family" and that helps
3. "referring" doesn't mean "mandated"; but not comfortable with "uniform screening"; screening is part of a service package
4. Is this only dependency court? Or family division too?
 - a. Our grant includes: unified family court, family and DV; will eventually include dependency
5. We should also include delinquency in the future
6. Re: uniform screening processes must be different depending on age
 - a. "uniform screening" means identifying around specific issues to say they are included in the population of those to whom services should be available
 - b. "uniform screening" is important in a system of care because you capture what type of violence or the level of conflict and why services are needed
 - c. Screening should occur as soon as possible; uniform screening will have captured them
7. Support rethinking whether services are mandated; now there are laws that if you fail to protect your child you can lose your child; there should be a threshold where you tell parents they could lose their children
8. We need to say "rapidly" refer
9. "through" not the "in" the court
10. This "screening" is the same for first response and court, screening will be universal no matter how they come in contact with the system
11. Wondering if we can a long term and short term goals
 - a. Yes, we can, we will capture in the Plan long term plan as well
 - b. For these goals we must stick to the short term
12. The unified family court judges do refer families now to be screened, we may want to use the word "identification" instead of "screening"
13. "screening" and identification are really different

FINAL: *The Court will identify children of HC families through early universal screening; refer them and their families to needed services and facilitate the appropriate tracking of the case for speedy resolution.*

5	4	3	2	1
0	14	15	0	0

Consensus achieved

FIRST RESPONDERS

DRAFT STATEMENT FOR DISCUSSION: All children exposed to violence will be identified and referred for appropriate comprehensive services by employing a uniform screening and response model for domestic violence incidents witnessed by children.

Member Comments:

1. Not just exposed to violence, but high conflict
 - a. For the first response piece, it is in response to criminal calls, police calls
2. Change “uniform” to “universal”
3. First responders include protective investigators (PIs) and it may not get to court or the police; potential for DV
4. Be very specific, we might use it for victims of sexual abuse; also which first responders do you mean?
 - a. for purpose of first grant, it is a law enforcement response
5. Add “and their families”
6. We need to change the category to law enforcement and protective investigators
7. What is operational definition of “high conflict” rather than domestic violence
 - a. We are working on that, getting information from court and gathering information
8. Frequently the child is the one arrested, how do we address this?
9. High conflict families not limited to DV; but for law enforcement, they only respond to DV
 - a. First response team doesn’t have to be the same for all situations
10. Are we talking about only law enforcement; what about hotlines? Probation officers? State attorneys?
 - a. It is the first responders, we need to look at law enforcement and protective investigators
11. You need to consider if you are going to help children that are in foster care
12. In reality, it is the law enforcement officers, the hotline is not always called to start the process
13. The children must be there at the time of the DV; detectives do call the hotline, officers don’t
14. In Homestead, even if the child is not there at the time of DV, they still call the victim advocate
15. I don’t always want DCF (Department of Children and Families) called out, I would rather put the onus on perpetrator

FINAL: First responders will use a coordinated response model, including universal screening, for children and their families exposed to domestic violence.

5	4	3	2	1
0	10	15	0	0

Consensus achieved

NOTE: for this phase of the grant “first responders” needs to be made clear, it could be expanded in the future

Additional Member comments following completion of the goal statements:

1. Major gaps that current structures have, we need to look immediately at gaps
2. Whole system needs a paradigm shift; current system is a money motivated "thing"; we need to stop thinking about money
3. We need to think about this systemically
4. We need to think about barriers too
5. Staff: the System of Care will be capturing the gaps and barriers; it will be documented and it will drive

SMALL GROUP WORK: OBJECTIVES

The development of the goal statements took the time allotted for this exercise. This will be initiated at the April meeting.

EVALUATIONS

Members were asked to complete their evaluations prior to departing. Everyone was thanked.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned.

COMMENT CARDS RECEIVED

"The facilitation of this session made a difference in the sense of accomplishment toward the service partnership goals."

-anonymous

"Can we include "universal screening" in first goal at this point? (It might just have been overlooked.)"

-anonymous

"New agencies will be recommended for (or funded) funding to provide services identified as critical gaps."

-Teresa Descilo

IDEA PARKING LOT

"Please send/fax your agency information and contact information to Family Court Services, which currently provides referrals for high conflict/DV cases. Send to:

Community Resource Specialist (CRS)

Olivia Mattson

Fax 305-349-5634

Email: omattson@jud11.flcourts.org

Or contact Linda at 305-349-5508

Thanks!"

"Do not forget Protective Investigators are among "first responders" and identify the DV situations that might or might not come to the attention of either a court or a law enforcement officer. Our team gets calls from PIs who have determined the presence of "high conflict", who don't go to any court, shelter or call police."

-anonymous
