

HVSA PAT PBC Working Group Notes -- Thursday, October 8, 2020

Meeting Objectives:

- *Updates on the home visitor and parent/caregiver engagement work*
- *Deeply discuss the PICCOLO and HFPI to inform:*
- *Each tool's alignment with outcomes,*
- *Implementation considerations for each tool, and*
- *Approaches to piloting the tool(s) this winter*

Participants:

- *PAT Leaders: Jasmine Barber, Annette Erickson, Cynthia Grayson, Cinthia Gutierrez, Kristi Jewell, Erin Lee, Mary McCracken, Shayla Montgomery, Elizabeth Morgan, Trissa Schiffner, Dianne Trevino, Alacia Thornton, Katie Turgeon, Nikki Weldon, Kristen Williams, Ryanne Zielinski,*
 - *State team: Laura Alfani, Izumi Chihara, Stacey Gillette, Minnette Mason, Kathy Tan, Rene Toolson, Ivon Urquilla*
-

I. Introduction, Check-In and Purpose

- *The intent of the meeting was to offer opportunity for discussion on the 2 measurement tools most aligned with the outcomes of Parent Child Interaction and Caregiver Well-being, the PICCOLO and HFPI. We were also going to provide a brief update on home visitor and stakeholder engagement opportunities and plans.*

II. Update on Stakeholder Engagement:

- *Caregiver Engagement*
Based in the input from Supervisors at the August meeting and home visitors in the focus groups, we are honing in on surveying caregivers and possibly a few focus groups (in direct partnership with programs interested in this). Our process has been delayed, awaiting approval from the DCYF and Washington Institutional Review Board (IRB), intended to ensure protections of "human subjects" when any research is involved.
- *Home Visitor Engagement Opportunities*
We have set up times with several PAT teams and focus groups in October (October 16, 21, and 29 still to occur). We're asking home visitors to offer advice on caregiver engagement options, offer insights on their efforts to address caregiver well-being and parent-child interactions, and get more specific on the actual outcomes they think they most meaningfully impact.
- *Learning from HV Input (Rene convened meetings with 4 different programs teams to date, with participants including a total of 7 supervisors, 20 parent educators and a few data coordinators; participants ranged in their longevity with PAT from 3 months to 13 years)*
 - *Parent Engagement*
The home visitor may be important in facilitating caregiver engagement. Focus groups may not be possible, particularly noting diverse languages, lack of direct relationships, etc. Surveys over the phone are familiar to many, but not all. Consent will be important. We may see bias because those who participate in this are also more likely to be strongly engaged in PAT.

- *Precise Outcomes – home visitors noted the following more precise outcomes as most meaningful: Reducing isolation; Improving mental health and reducing anxiety; Improving interactions and parenting behaviors.*
- *Active ingredients/Key Activities in home visits included: Supportive relationships/coming alongside; teaching and guiding; noticing, affirming strengths and skills; demonstrating and modeling positive actions; offering whole attention during HV; and offering connection to resources.*
- *Essential ingredients include: regularity of visits; support, trust, accountability to allow messaging to happen; safe, receptive ear; and taking an individualized approach*

III. Discussion on Measurement Tools: PICCOLO and HFPI

The large group divided into 4 small groups and discussed the 2 tools. The following notes summarizes All of the groups notes as they were recorded in their unique Google-docs document.

Which domains BEST align with PAT?

Tool/Domain	PAT	Tool/Domain	PAT
<i>HFPI</i>	<i>Can make a case for all</i>	<i>PICCOLO</i>	
Social Support	4 <i>Group Connections; Resource and Referral</i>	Parenting Efficacy	3.75
Parent-Child Interaction	3.75	Teaching	3.25
Problem Solving	3 <i>Indirectly; Part of PAT curriculum</i>	Responsiveness	3
Mobilizing Resources	3.5 <i>Resource/referral connections = essential requirements</i>	Encouragement	2.5
Depression	3.25 <i>Multiple screenings, opportunities for discussion</i>		
Personal Care	2.75 <i>Foundational visits go over medical home, immunization, well-child, postpartum topics</i>		
Home Environment	2.75 <i>Some – safety, childproofing</i>		
Role Satisfaction	1		

Which domains BEST align with Parent-Child Interaction Outcome?

Tool/Domain	Parent Child Interaction	Tool/Domain	Parent Child Interaction
<i>HFPI</i>	<i>Can make a case for all</i>	<i>PICCOLO</i>	
Parent-Child Interaction	3.25	Parenting Efficacy	3.75
Role Satisfaction	2.5	Teaching	3.25
Problem Solving	2.25 <i>How we ask questions – e.g., how will your child react to this?</i>	Responsiveness	3
Depression	2 <i>Depression impacts interaction with child</i>	Encouragement	2.5
Home Environment	1.75		
Social Support	1.5 <i>Not directly</i>		

Tool/Domain	Parent Child Interaction	Tool/Domain	Parent Child Interaction
Personal Care	1.5		
Mobilizing Resources	.25		

Which domains BEST align with Caregiver Well-being Outcome?

Tool/Domain	Caregiver Well-being	Tool/Domain	Caregiver Well-being
<i>HFPI</i> Can make a case for all		<i>PICCOLO</i>	
Social Support	4 <i>Well-being can be impacted with connected socially - protective factors</i>	Parenting Efficacy	2.25
Depression	3.5 <i>Opportunity to demonstrate support for caregivers and impact on mental health beyond depression</i>	Encouragement	.25
Personal Care	3.5 <i>Family-well-being topics include this</i>	Responsiveness	
Mobilizing Resources	3	Teaching	
Role Satisfaction	3		
Problem Solving	2.5		
Home Environment	1.5		
Parent-Child Interaction	.25		

What people like about each tool?

– Both tools are representative of PAT work with clients around Parent-Child Interactions

HFPI	PICCOLO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – PAT approved – Feels more comprehensive, addresses more domains than PICCOLO - focuses on parent/child interaction AND parent well-being – Self-report: uses the parent’s voice – Several domains are key to PAT work (Parent child interaction, social and emotional support, safety/child maltreatment) – More interactive with parent - stimulates deeper conversations, leads to stronger relationship, greater understanding of the family (e.g. depression and social support subscales) – Tip cards have good graphics that aid in interpreting the scores and provide relevant supports to family – Helpful for working with goals – Don’t have to use all the subscales – Can capture change over time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – PAT and MIECHV approved – Strong tool measuring parent-child interaction – Gives concrete feedback to parents – supports responsive parenting – Narrow focus – more measurable over time? – Observation based tool vs. an interview based tool

What do people dislike about each tool?

HFPI	PICCOLO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not approved by MIECHV - Many questions - 4 pages, may be overwhelming - Unsure which components will be used - Able to detect change over time? - Concern about training - Can't substitute LFP/Family synthesis record (required by PAT) - Is the parenting efficacy scale culturally relevant? Seems white middle class - Not validated for improvement across all domains Only 3 subscales have significant findings in evaluation - Limited information available online 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Narrower, less comprehensive (doesn't caregiver well-being or inner self) - Observation – could be biased by home visitor lens (e.g. perspective not parent-centered) - It feels paternalistic. - Does it stimulate deeper or difficult conversations - the parent educator can avoid - Cost - Able to detect change over time? - Limited information available online

Equity Considerations

HFPI	PICCOLO
<i>POSITIVE</i>	<i>POSITIVE</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Translated to Spanish (possibly more) - Uses the parent voice/perspective, not educator's observation - Assesses many factors impacting family well-being - More culturally appropriate (may need to ask this of some of the folks in our cultures) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Translated into other languages
<i>NEGATIVE</i>	<i>NEGATIVE</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Doesn't use the voice/perspective of the parent - Feels less culturally relevant; also wonder about bias in scoring - Doesn't reveal a comprehensive picture of the family - Would like to see the words used when translated to Spanish. Language could lead to bias.

Other considerations (Training, Costs, Use of video, Other Implementation Issues)

HFPI	PICCOLO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Costs less time and money - Can unique domains be used (break it up)? - Can families complete on their own? - Use strengths based/asset based perspective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recording observations of how PICCOLO components are supported through parent/child interaction - PICCOLO is similar to NCAST - Observations of parent-child interactions in short span of time (5-10 minutes) - Explore use of PICCOLO with those home visitors using it - Get more information from Brookes publishing - Scoring questions

Questions:

- *Can we combine tools?*
- *What is the best strategic approach for identifying a measurement tool? For Performance-Based Contracting, is it better to be narrow than broad?*
- *Wondering if the combination of some aspects of both may be the approach to capture full picture?*

Poll on Tool Preference at beginning and end of discussion

Based on what you know right now and the discussion from today, what is your preference for measurement?	Pre Discussion		Post Discussion	
Undecided	7	(35%)	3	(18.75%)
Use both the PICCOLO and one or more domains of the HFPI	2	(4%)	2	(12.5%)
Use the one or more domains of the HFPI	5	(25%)	9	(56.25%)
Use the PICCOLO	6	(30%)	2	(12.5%)
Grand Total	20	(100%)	16	(100%)

- *Next steps: Participants were invited to continue to add comments to their groups “Google Doc” for the next week, and then all comments would be summarized for the notes. Start Early will be offering a training on the PICCOLO in November/December that some programs could participate, if they desire. We will keep talking about these tools, and likely may pilot both to gather more information to help with the decision making. Certainly, the use of both tools in a remote environment is a consideration, given current circumstances of the pandemic.*

IV. Meeting Process Reflections

- *Appreciate small groups to allow for more discussion, and using the google docs tool was mostly helpful, but it took some time for each group to figure it out.*
- *Appreciate being involved in the discussion, and wondering who will make the ultimate decision on tools.*
- *How to preserve the connection of discussion from the prior meeting?*