

Sub Committee: Wellbeing Outcomes				
POS Co-Chair: Margaret Vimont, JCFS		Meeting date/location: Thompson Center, June 23, 2016		
DCFS Co-Chair: Larry Small, transitioning to Dr. Kim Mann		Start Time: 9:00am		
Attach attendance list				
Larry Small, Margaret Vimont, Kim Mann, Jennifer O’Brian, Jennifer Pryor, Mark Courtney, Steve Buddhe, Marge Berglind, Kathy Grziek, Rob Hjertquist				
Summary of Discussion Items:				
I. Discussion of DCFS Transformational plan and the Wellbeing committee’s intersection with its goals and focus. II. Discussion of Independent Measure of Domains 3 and 4 of Wellbeing to complete recommendations.		Required Action: Convey results of discussion to Jody Grutza of DCFS	Person Responsible: Margaret Vimont and Kim Mann	
Welcome & Introductions				
1. Committee work addresses a section of the BH Implementation Plan which states that overarching well being outcomes will be developed and tracking mechanisms will be put into place. As this committee’s work is focused solely on that project, its place in the Plan seems clear and evident. 2. Focus of meeting was a side by side comparison of the potential independent measures for Domain 3 and 4, Emotional/ Behavioral and Social Functioning. Outcome: recommendation to use the SDQ, Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire for Domain 3. Discussion summary:				
Measure	SDQ	BASC	Columbia	Ohio
Advantages	Short (5-10 min) Multiple informants Free w Online tools available Easy to understand As good as the CBCL May be	Schools using it now Multiple informants Comprehensive Elaborate computer analysis Deep look Can be used for	Short In use by some MH providers Free	Shortish (48 items) Strengths items Sensitive to change, can plot over time Might already be in new residential

	residentially applied	spec populations		procedures; ICG using it now
Disadvantages	No youth <11 Less depth Only 3 pt scale—adequate to measure change?	Expensive Long and very cumbersome	Some of the ?s would elicit N/A or inappropriate responses Not robust/behavioral	Developed for high end youth (items not universal) No training that explains items satisfactorily Not for teacher or school settings
Comments	Perhaps a supplement for special populations would be needed The best as a validation tool	Length and cost make this not implementable	Not sufficient to measure domain	Does not match need for universal measure
<p>Final step: fully vet the Youth Connections and the Social Network Questionnaire as best candidates for Domain 4 independent measure at next committee convening on July 12.</p> <p>The Youth Connections measure was also discussed. Advantages include: it is free, computerized interpretation available, it is already in the residential procedures and is used in the CIPP already. Disadvantages include: it is meant for discharge planning, only meant for youth 15 and up and is much more applicable for a subset of the population than the whole.</p> <p>This measure will be compared to the Social Network Questionnaire at the next meeting for a recommendation for an independent measure of Domain 4.</p>				
Note Any Formal Written Recommendations that have been made to Full CWAC:				Status Update. New/Pending/Response from DCFS Received:

DCFS CWAC SUB COMMITTEE MINUTES



Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Adjourn Time: 11:00	
Next Meeting Date/location: by phone July 12, 2016	
Date Minutes Submitted: July 14, 2016	