



# DEMO 1 PROJECT

Insights and Learnings  
from the Fellows

# WHO WE ARE AND WHY WE JOINED SPECTRUM

*Jamie Pfau*

MSW, PhD Student in Community Health Sciences  
Social Worker, Treatment Foster Parent, All-around Fabulous Human

*Colette Scatliff*

BEEd, JD Candidate 2022  
Former Teacher, Foster Parent, Graduating Law Student, Big softie who regularly cries about stats

# RECAP ON DEMO 1

## Overview:

- Comparing two groups:
  - Cohort 1: Children who are taken into care; with
  - Cohort 2: Children who are in families with an open CFS file
- Using Health, Justice, and Education outcomes
- Focus on children and families with discretion/uncertainty about whether they need to be taken into care
- Instrumental variable analysis ("fancy math")

# DEMONSTRATION 1 PROJECT TEAM

## Advisory Circle:

Florence Paynter (Knowledge Keeper)

Sherry Copenace (Knowledge Keeper)

Roberta Godin (Grandmother)

Cora Morgan (First Nations Family Advocate Office)

Kayla Frank (Policy Analyst, First Nations Family Advocate Office)

## Academic/Research:

Marni Brownell (MCHP)

Nathan Nickel (MCHP)

Marlyn Bennett (UM, Social Work)

Lisa Flaten (MCHP)

Heather Prior (MCHP)

Randy Walld (MCHP)

Hygiea Casiano (UM, Psychiatry)

## Student Fellows:

Jamie Pfau (Fellow)

Anita Durksen (Fellow)

Colette Scatliff (Fellow)

Stephaney Patrick (Fellow)

Soomin Han (Fellow)

Sana Amjad (Fellow)

Mikayla Hunter (Fellow)

## Community Organisations:

Nora Murdock (MFNERC)

Liz Decaire (FNHSSM)

Stephanie Sinclair (FNHSSM)

Kayla Frank (First Nations Family Advocate Office)

Jennifer Chartrand (First Nations Family Advocate Office)

## Government Representatives:

Scott Sinclair (Labour, Consumer Protection & Government Services)

Chris Nash (MB Families)

Elizabeth Debicka (MB Families)

Anna Slavina (Labour, Consumer Protection & Government Services)

Jay Rodgers (General CFS Authority)

Teresa Mayer (General CFS Authority)

# WHY WE LOVE BEING PART OF DEMO 1

- We care about kids in care!
- Academic and professional development outside the scope of our own studies
- Respect for the expertise of each person in the room
- Fellows have a real seat at the table
- We are always asking who else needs to sit at the table
- We are learning how to collaborate across sectors
- The whole group is committed, and it shows!
- The Demo 1 team is really trying to "walk the talk" on our SPECTRUM values

# CONSIDERATIONS ALONG THE WAY

- Different backgrounds sometimes means different "languages"
- Building consensus around a shared direction and narrowing our research questions takes time and lots of circling back
- There is so much data in the Manitoba Centre for Health Policy and only so much we can do with a demo project due to funding, human resources and timing constraints
- Definitions/terms are tricky! Whose definition is best?
- Framing - how do we ensure all partners are comfortable with the questions we are asking and how we present our findings? In future, how will we build consensus around the policy changes we promote?



*"Stats are stories with the tears wiped away"*

Caring deeply about this work means emotions can sometimes get the best of us!

# THE BIG TAKEAWAY

We want to express our sincere gratitude for this opportunity to learn through experience, to be welcomed to the table, and to be encouraged to grow in our academic and professional abilities.

Demo 1 has shown us that despite all the challenges and time that go into collaborative research, the rewards are immeasurable.

We are so fortunate to be a part of this team, and we are so encouraged to work alongside such fabulous humans with the shared goal of improving outcomes for children in care.



# PUBLIC POLICY STAGE

- A key stage facing the SPECTRUM Partnership is to translate the data from demo project #1 into viable public policy options.
- This proposal offers a pathway for SPECTRUM to consider. At the end of this presentation, small breakout rooms will be held to discuss this pathway.

# Step 1. Develop teams.

- Communicate with partners directly to determine their level of desired involvement in the public policy phase of this project. Some may want an active role; others may wish for the development to occur by others but provide feedback.
- For the former group, which are referred to as the **POLICY DEVELOPMENT TEAM**, the Policy Co-Leads can outline time requirements and essential readings.
- For the latter group, which are referred to as the **POLICY TESTING TEAM**, this may involve focus groups to review the policy options (based on the research findings for demo project #1) and test to see if they resolve the policy problem identified. Of the policy options developed, this team identifies one policy option as a recommendation.
- Another team is the **DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM TEAM** who will be engaged at step 2, but in a role different than as members of the **policy development team**. This team can be members of the **policy development team**, but they also need to function as a validator of the feasibility of policy options in step 3 from the very beginning

# Steps 2 & 3.

- **Steps 2. Review research results.**
- Joint meeting between the research team and the **policy development team** to review the research results.
  
- **Step 3. Develop policy options.**
- **Policy development team** meets with **department/program team** to develop feasible policy options. Fellows / RAs provide significant support in terms of research, analysis and writing.

# Step 4: Review Policy options.

- **Policy development team** meets with **policy testing team** to discuss and explore the policy options. The goal here is to ensure that the policy options reflect experiential knowledge about the policy problem and the ability of the policy options to resolve the policy problem. Discussion will identify whether one policy option should be recommended to Government of MB and other stakeholders.

# Steps 5-7

- **Step 5: Present policy options to partnership.**
- Present policy options and the recommended policy option to the entire partnership for review and approval.
- **Step 6: Present policy recommendation to Government of Manitoba and build policy source materials.**
- **Policy development team** builds framing of the recommended policy option and policy outputs (i.e., Memorandum to Cabinet). SPECTRUM partnership prepares source materials (i.e., policy memo) to present to Government of Manitoba.
- **Step 7. Government of Manitoba review**
- Government of Manitoba reviews policy options / recommendation either in Cabinet or in Cabinet Committee

# Breakout discussion

1. **Is this proposal a reasonable pathway to translate the data from demo project #1 into public policy? Why or why not?**
2. This proposal relies on a team-approach to translate the data into public policy with the opportunity to come back to the larger partnership for review and approval.
  - a) **Are these teams sufficient (ie. are there too many teams? Not enough teams?)?**
  - b) **SPECTRUM will be asking partners to voluntarily join the teams. How can the partnership support you/your organization to becomes involved in a team (i.e., what information do you require? Other supports)?**