

7.21.26
DCF Dashboard Working Group
Meeting Minutes

- Introductions and reasons for joining the working group
 - Need and desire for transparency
 - Capturing racial disparities in information across the state and plan for change
- Reviewing requirements in the statute
 - Components of Section 11
 - Noted – the need for people to access the information without making an account, making it user-friendly and reducing concerns of being tracked or targeted
- Timeline
 - Having everyone come back to the next meeting with points that they want included based on experience, submit to WG or to the co-chairs in advance
- What would people like to see?
 - Comparison to Wisconsin dashboard
 - Commissioner Hamilton
 - DCF could provide what they already have mocked up for review rather than starting from scratch
 - Information sharing, along with real time data like Wisconsin
 - DCF has more data that the group could consider for inclusion along with other sources from their site
 - Sharing with the group in advance of the next meeting
 - Looking at what we currently have available and understanding the diversity of DCF cases
 - Acknowledged that we are not reporting on individual cases
 - WI Older Youth Outcomes dashboard → segmented and detailed information on older youth
 - Reports on children with disabilities, child abuse/neglect database
 - Difference between static reports and then the data visualizations like WI dashboard
 - WI dashboard organizes information efficiently
 - Links to both static reports and visualizations
 - Volume metrics
 - DCF has a mock-up of how this could be organized similar to WI
 - Screen-by-county to be able to see information from each county
 - Seeing where there are the greatest needs and the correlation with services

- Providing top 3 or 5 points included in dashboard, such as case load, consistent with language of the bill
 - DCF can bring what they already track
 - There may be things that they can track that wouldn't fit for the dashboard
- Geography is useful for public dashboard
 - How many different types of geographies/what size?
 - It was noted that too tight a radius can run into small Number problems
 - Should we use
 - federal county equivalents
 - CT counties
 - map it to COGs?
 - Historical trends and disaggregating data
 - How far back do we want the data to go?
 - How far back is feasible?
- Engaging in addressing the needs of stakeholders
 - Legislative
 - Providers
 - Community/public
 - Municipalities
 - Workers
 - Who else?
 - Reach out to them to see what they need
 - How would we collect the suggestions?
- Reviewing DCF's mock-up
 - Provide input on what we would like to see more of
 - Specific points to be included
- Dashboard can help the morale of social workers if they see positive movement
 - Workforce data such as caseloads and turnovers, case outcomes
 - WI dashboard has this information
 - Some data will be for legislators and DCF staff to share instead of going on the dashboard
- Rep. Paris' requests
 - Keeping data updated quarterly
 - Permanency timeliness → time to reunification, adoption, and guardianship which is on the WI dashboard
 - Monitoring racial disproportionality
- Timeline and next steps
 - Meeting every two weeks because of the October 1st deadline

- Mia will send out the date once we know when group members are available
- Everyone read the minutes to make sure we are capturing what WG wants in the dashboard
- **Members need to respond with their availability and priorities by Friday, July 24th**
- Possibly establish subgroups after seeing the mock-up
- Possibly break data into the four mandates in statute plus two others
 - Prevention
 - Behavioral Health
 - Child Protection
 - Administration (HR)
 - Safety
 - Permanency