

SERVICE PATHWAY / COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES

THURSDAY, MAY 13, 2014, 9-11AM, CHILDREN’S MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES, 3RD FLOOR

IN ATTENDANCE: Kerry Cole, Beverley Bell-Rowbotham (Data Analysis Coordinator), Melanie Dunlop (Co-chair), Terry Swift (Co-chair), Cathie West, Donalda Simmons, Amy McGuinness, Bianca Sclippa-Barrett, Wendy Anderson (Coordinator), Allison Dall (recorder)

REGRETS: Danita Norton, Paul Meadows, Susan Seaman, Susan Quaiff, Karen Richey

MANDATE: To define more clearly the community service pathway, develop “no wrong door” and “Warm Hand-Off” resource materials for service providers and implement distribution, education, awareness and training.

Item	Discussion/Motions	Recommendations <i>(things go forward to the Network)</i>	Action <i>(including Person Responsible and Completion Date)</i>
1. Welcome and Introductions	Terry welcomed all Committee Members.		
2. Review of Agenda	Motion to approve agenda for today. Moved by Melanie Dunlop Seconded by Bianca Sclippa-Barrett All in Favour. Carried.		
3. Accept Minutes from April 10th	Motion to approved minutes from April 10 th Moved by Bianca Sclippa-Barrett Seconded by Melanie Dunlop All in Favour. Carried.		
4. Business Arising from Minutes			

Item	Discussion/Motions	Recommendations <i>(things go forward to the Network)</i>	Action <i>(including Person Responsible and Completion Date)</i>
a) Network Meeting Highlights from April 24, 2014	<p>CYSN minutes are expected to be posted today or tomorrow on the website.</p> <p>The Family Engagement group exercise was a huge part of the Network meeting. Also, the change-over in CYSN banker effective April 1st from Children’s Mental Health Services to the Hastings and Prince Edward Learning Foundation. The banker is accountable to funders for the money. It was also clarified where Triple P falls in terms of the banker. It will remain with CMHS who receives the Community Capacity Building funds directly and is responsible for reporting to MCYS.</p> <p>A call out for members was made for the Aboriginal Planning Working Group which was struck by the Network. Meeting occurred on May 12th and another one scheduled for the end of May. A large portion of the \$8780 allocated by EDU covers Coordinator’s time.</p>		http://www.hpechildrenandyouth.ca/about-the-network/
5. Work Plan a) Children and Youth Mental Health Framework	<p>Terry reported that he, Cathie West (Youthab) and Debbie Cornick (PCYC) had a meeting with representatives from Northumberland County Children’s Mental Health agencies, Rebound</p>		

Item	Discussion/Motions	Recommendations <i>(things go forward to the Network)</i>	Action <i>(including Person Responsible and Completion Date)</i>
<p>b) Referral Guide by Function</p>	<p>and Kinark, to discuss transformation. They will meet again before the summer. Terry clarified that they are meeting with these representatives; however, this does not mean that agencies believe this is way the expansion should be going. Down the road they will perhaps look at a letter going out to the Ministry indicating their concerns about the size and direction of the catchment area that is being considered.</p> <p>Cathie shared that based on information she has gathered, it looks like transformation will be delayed for children’s mental health. This is due to the election. However, the adult amalgamation will be moving forward.</p> <p>Wendy announced that she just received notice that Lynette Cumming will replace Sybil Foley as the MCYS Program Manager for the Network.</p> <p>Wendy stated that she is currently updating and revising the Referral Guide by Function. Following discussion at our last meeting, Wendy invited Cathie West and Debbie Cornick to attend today’s meeting.</p>		

Item	Discussion/Motions	Recommendations <i>(things go forward to the Network)</i>	Action <i>(including Person Responsible and Completion Date)</i>
	<p>Cathie expressed that she has concerns that Youthhab is not identified under the shelter category of the Guide.</p> <p>Committee was reminded of our need to keep the guide concise and user friendly – was developed as a No Wrong Door resource for service providers - not intended for families.</p> <p>Cathie explained that 310 Open does not provide a very large number of referrals for Youthhab around housing. They are funded by the hospitals and the South East LHIN.</p> <p>Cathie identified for the Committee that the Hastings Housing Resource Centre is funded through Youthhab; however, they are geared more towards low income, older (over 50 year olds) clients with the focus of helping people find housing but not necessarily getting them into this housing. This is a short-term program and may in fact not exist after December 31, 2014. United Way has recently donated \$8000 to provide some intensive case management to this program and there is more work being done in terms of helping clients get into homes.</p>		

Item	Discussion/Motions	Recommendations <i>(things go forward to the Network)</i>	Action <i>(including Person Responsible and Completion Date)</i>
	<p>Cathie identified that Hastings County Social Services, Hastings County Housing Program Branch, provides access to all social services. This service has a long wait list for housing and may in fact take years.</p> <p>She further identified that Mental Health Services and the Canadian Mental Health Association both have homes in the area with some very specific criteria to access (i.e.; have a significant mental health disorder in some cases). Cathie also acknowledged that there is another group who has homes but at this time was uncertain of the name.</p> <p>Cathie shared that emergency beds can now be accessed through the Red Cross (previously the Salvation Army did this). They have very limited funding and do not want this heavily relied upon. They do place people in motels when required in an emergency situation.</p> <p>Youthhab differs from all these resources in that they specifically service 16-24 year olds. They have a total of 54 beds in addition to the Transition Home with 9 beds and are staffed, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This program</p>		

Item	Discussion/Motions	Recommendations <i>(things go forward to the Network)</i>	Action <i>(including Person Responsible and Completion Date)</i>
c) Family Engagement Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Completed MCYS Template 	<p>provides life and social skills and clients are assessed for mental health issues.</p> <p>In discussion the Committee has agreed to potentially revamp the Shelter Category in the Guide. Cathie has agreed to speak to people in terms of who should be at the next meeting to discuss this, specifically, Rita Shephard. Other names mentioned were Bob Cottrell (President) and Scott Henderson (Vice-President) of All Together Housing.</p> <p>In the discussion it was mentioned that it may be wise to break housing down into categories; i.e., emergency, youth, family, those with mental health issues, etc.</p> <p>Wendy requested that Committee members should review the Guide for similar clarifications and submit ideas via email or bring to next meeting to discuss.</p> <p>Wendy reported that the final evaluation template was completed by the regional coordinators/ planners, reviewed by liaisons and submitted to MCYS on the due date. All</p>		<p>All Together Housing - a house on Victoria Avenue in Belleville for low income individuals facing complex health-related issues, both physical and mental – five one-bedroom units and one transitional unit.</p> <p>Cathie will bring forward names to Wendy of individuals who will be able to assist in looking at access to housing in HPE.</p> <p>Wendy suggested that perhaps for the 2014/2015 year, rather than taking on another Innovation Fund project, our focus should be to</p>

Item	Discussion/Motions	Recommendations <i>(things go forward to the Network)</i>	Action <i>(including Person Responsible and Completion Date)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review CYSN April 24th Discussion Summary • Plan June 25th CYSN report-back/exercise 	<p>funds were spent. The template reported that the project achieved its goals but not in the way anticipated. Challenges were identified as well as opportunities. Also, the template contains advice to other communities who may want to embrace this same challenge or make use of the findings. Each of the four communities reported on how they are moving forward with family engagement.</p> <p>The group reviewed and discussed the Network exercise findings. Thanks to Melanie, Donalda, Danita, Beverley, Kelly and Bianca for facilitating this activity.</p> <p>Deferred to next meeting.</p>		<p>build on this work by completing and implementing our community plan.</p> <p>Please see notes at end of minutes.</p>
6. Next Steps	Prior to next meeting, Committee will take a closer look at the consultant's report.		Wendy will send out reference pages for definition, action options, best practices, etc.
7. Next Meeting	Next meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 16 th , 2014, 9-11am, CMHS (previously June 12 th).		If you are attending or not, contact: dunlmela@alcdsb.on.ca tswift@cmhs-hpe.on.ca wanderson@cmhs-hpe.on.ca
8. Adjournment	10:46am		

Notes from 5c)

In order to move forward with the CYSN family engagement plan . . .

Should the Network “directly” or “directly” engage families?

The Network needs to give parents a voice to help shape what the community service system will look like.

Regarding the question about “direct” versus “indirect” engagement, some groups initially said “yes” to “direct” engagement but switched to “indirect” after dialogue.

Direct engagement was identified as problematic because it could be intimidating for families and is not representative of all families (tokenism). The Network was cautioned about duplicating what agencies should do or are already doing.

Appropriate engagement ideas included surveys, community forums, inviting families to speak at Network events (e.g. Expo), use of advisories.

Manitoba has a model of family councils from various areas. Representatives from these councils come together yearly and discuss things.

The exercise brought forward the idea that family engagement begins with “No Wrong Door”. Suggests we continue system-wide implementation.

Committee Discussion:

The question was raised whether or not families even feel that the system is “broken”, and if not, is this a good use of our resources? The 2011/12 CARP research told us that families do feel the system is “broken”; i.e., lack of trust, respect, difficult to access services locally, unclear on what is available, etc., and clearly identified that engagement would add value to our service system.

The Network should acknowledge the time and money required to engage families and the fact that all functions within the Network need to be represented; e.g., basic needs, employment, transportation, education, justice and legal, health, safety and protection, prenatal to 12 supports and resources, social and recreation.

What Should Family Engagement (at a Planning Table Level) Look Like?

Beverley reminded us that we are all members of families. Consider engaging as a family member rather than just a professional.

Cathie suggested that looking at things from an educational standpoint is likely helpful for families who want to avoid the stigma attached to seeking various services.

Discussion around what works in the community. The Committee should look at where there are pockets of parent committees already gathering.

Donalda suggested a common tool be created to assess individual agencies. Service providers could look at their own agencies and see how they are doing in terms of family engagement.

Beverley stated that family engagement is not an end in itself but rather a means to an end - the end being that we want to provide the best service possible to families. This relates directly to the CYSN vision - “children, youth and families living in HPE easily access a responsive service system the meets their needs.” How can families help get us there?

Discussion suggested that we build on what is already working within the community and to look at what other communities are doing. This information is contained in the consultant’s report, as is our definition of family engagement. But even within this Committee, people have different interpretations of family engagement – e.g., confusing “service delivery” with “planning”.

What the Committee needs to understand is that this is a process - where would we like to be in 5 years. A community charter was suggested. Beverley mentioned Kid Friendly Calgary.

Donalda suggested we look closely at best practice.

Next Steps:

Terry suggested that Committee members read the project report, “Developing Common Understanding of Family Engagement in South East Ontario” in preparation for the next meeting. This is our working document for moving forward on family engagement.

Develop a report-back/exercise for June 26th Network meeting.