

**Safe Babies Design Team  
Legislative Workgroup Meeting  
May 6, 2020  
9:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.**

*Minutes*

**Key Questions Raised:**

- What were the roadblocks in advancing the previous baby court bill ([SB 5494](#))?
  - How can we advance a baby court strategy without state or local public funding?
  - Are there specific policy areas which legislators can support without a cost?
  - How do we help the court system to elevate baby courts (or specialty courts in general) as we enter a new era of provision for court services?
  - What do we need to know from other Workgroups to inform legislative strategy?
1. **Welcome.** Present at this meeting were Rachel Sottile, Gina WasseMiller, Jill May, Justice Bobbe Bridge (Ret.), Keli Drake, Kelly Warner-King, Laurie Lippold, Lisa Mansfield, Megan Campbell, Michelle Williams, Morgan Silverman, and Senator Jeannie Darneille.
  2. **Review of Core Principles.** Workgroup members reviewed the answers to the “Core Principles” from the first Design Team Meeting. These principles serve to help ground members on this work. No comments or changes were made to the lists.
  3. **Legislative history in WA.** Senator Darneille, Laurie Lippold, and Megan Campbell informed the Workgroup of the legislative history in Washington ([SB 5494](#)) and where this work could go moving forward.
    - a. There was high support of [SB 5494](#) during this past legislative session, but the bill lacked momentum. Although there was some movement, it stopped in the budget process. Moving forward, it is essential to clearly message the savings benefit of implementing baby courts in communities, identify the legislative intent, and ensure that the legislature is educated on its need and effectiveness.
    - b. The largest challenge to this legislative effort is the budget. The Legislative Workgroup will need to consider the state’s financial reality, as Washington is currently facing an \$8.5 Billion deficit over the course of the next four years. The state will be hard pressed to keep basic services open. Questions raised in response to the financial landscape include:

- How can we advance a baby court strategy without public money or state funding?
  - Are there specific policy areas which legislators can support without a cost?
- c. Rachel suggested that perhaps the group creates a pathway to a baby court plan for the future. She asked the group if there were components of the implementation plan that could benefit children and families at this time, be feasible with certain levels of funding, and championed in the 2021 session.
2. **What do we need to know.** Kelly Warner-King emphasized to the group that this is an opportunity to create a comprehensive implementation plan, pull together what is already being done in the realm of families and communities, and find ways to prevent families from entering the court.
- a. The Workgroup discussed that the superior court needs to support future baby court legislation. It was suggested to bring Judge Hickman into these conversations, and delve into ways in which baby courts could be integrated as a best practice for Washington superior courts.
  - b. One member mentioned that the Legislative Workgroup should invite Judge Leanderson, or other judicial officers and representatives from the SCJA to contribute to these conversations.
  - c. The SBCT approach does require a coordinator. One model where courts are finding value is the FJCIP, where courts have received an FTE or partial FTE person who works with the courts and looks at data. This model could be a possibility to consider when designing an implementation strategy.
  - d. Leaders need to receive training on DEI at an ongoing occurrence. Kelly discussed the need for training for judicial officers, and mentioned that the Florida SBCT Team reallocated court improvement funds to provide training.
  - e. The group emphasized that SBCT efforts should not be viewed as an add-on to existing work. Rather than creating additional work, they must look for ways to be integrative, and leverage resources to invest in areas where it has the highest impact. This could apply to dollar resources, and also to people currently working in related efforts. Individuals who are working in the courts, DCYF, or community organizations could be re-deployed to a role that helps coordinate or contribute to SBCT implementation.
3. **Mechanism of Integration and Coordination of Statewide Efforts & Data.** Rachel revisited Florida as a key reference when creating Washington's legislative structure.

- a. Morgan Silverman explained that in conversing with the Florida team, it was clear that the oversight role was necessary to conduct ongoing training, maintain consistency across sites, keep sites accountable to providing services equitably, look at data, and address staff turnover. If it is of interest to the Workgroup, CCYJ could invite a representative from the Florida Team to a future meeting.
  - b. Senator Darneille mentioned that fidelity in the baby court bill is important to the legislature. She suggested looking at the JDAI Model as an additional reference for the Workgroup's strategy.
4. **Wrap Up & Next Steps.** The workgroup will review the [Florida Legislation \(HB 1105\)](#) before the next Design Team Meeting on May 18. Members were encouraged to connect with the CCYJ team if they have additional questions, comments, or suggestions following the meeting. Lisa volunteered to report out to the Design Team on the Legislative Workgroup's conversation highlights. CCYJ will invite Julie Hoffman and Judge Leaderson to this workgroup.

#### **UPCOMING EVENTS**

1. Design Team Meeting II: Monday May 18, 10:00 - 11:30 a.m.
2. Safe Babies Court Team™ 101 Webinar: Wednesday May 20 11:00 - 12:30 p.m.

**Safe Babies Design Team  
Funding Workgroup Meeting  
May 13, 2020  
11:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.**

*Minutes*

**Key Questions Raised:**

- Are there ways in which to combine resources to leverage what's already there?
- What would we use HRSA funds for? What do we need/could leverage?
- What do we want to apply for?

1. **Welcome.** Present at this meeting were Janie Huddleston, Justice Bridge (Ret.), Kelly Warner-King, Michelle Williams, Morgan Silverman, Tonia McClanahan, and Torey Silloway.
2. **Review of Core Principles.** Workgroup members reviewed the answers to the “Core Principles” from the first Design Team Meeting. These principles serve to ground members throughout this work. No changes were made to the lists.
3. **Overview of Current Funding Opportunities.**
  - a. A recap of the Legislative Meeting was provided to inform members of the financial landscape (*See Legislative Meeting Minutes*). This highlighted future funding challenges to SBCT implementation. In planning for future implementation, it will be key to find ways to leverage and integrate existing resources around the state.
  - b. ZERO TO THREE provided an overview of the HRSA funding opportunity. ZTT will release a RFP to subcontract for one year and expect to define three pools of funding:
    - i. **States** - Awards will be granted to three new states, which will have a minimum of 3 sites per state. (For WA, this would be in addition to Pierce County). The statewide team needs to look at buy-in from the state agency and alignment of the SBCT approach. This also requires a state team to support efforts.
    - ii. **Site expansion** - this serves to increase a site's capacity to increase the number of families served by at least double (2 dockets).
    - iii. **Capacity building** - this funding serves to help states align with the SBCT approach and work towards becoming a full implementation site, and help align with the SBCT components.
  - c. States applying for funding will need to design their budget, and can apply for multiple buckets of funding.

- i. It was noted that the RFP will require a full state team; ZTT staff suggested one approach in creating the state team is to reallocate or integrate existing positions rather than create new roles.
  - ii. ZTT plans to issue the RFP in June.
- d. Selected states are required to participate in evaluation. States selected will have access to the ZERO TO THREE database without charge. The State Team will analyze and enter data; no additional evaluation dollars for state. More requirements seen in RFP. Questions raised in response to the RFP discussion include:
  - i. What do we currently have that can be leveraged?
  - ii. What existing positions are there that can be repurposed to support state-level SBCT implementation?
- e. The workgroup discussed what roles and resources are necessary to launch a new site. The discussion outlined ideas for leveraging existing funding as well as ideas for what the HRSA funding could be used for.
- f. The Workgroup discussed engagement opportunities with donors and foundations. It was suggested to give a briefing of the SBCT work to Philanthropy Northwest.
- g. Partnerships are a critical component to maintain sustainability. The group questioned if DCYF should have formal involvement in the statewide team, and mentioned the need for an oversight committee.
- h. The Workgroup discussed the role of the Community Coordinator, and where they should be housed. There are benefits and barriers to having the Coordinator both in the courts and in a nonprofit agency. Experiences will also vary between jurisdictions.
- i. Parent Allies are also key in providing support.
- j. The Workgroup should also consider the time allocated by individuals involved in SBCTs, such as attorneys, judges, and social workers, and how this influences the funding plan.

#### **4. Wrap Up & Next Steps.**

##### **a. CCYJ staff will follow up on the following points:**

- i. Discussions regarding what state team roles can be leveraged/combined with other roles
- ii. Learn more about the funders' circle and **opportunities** for private support
- iii. Discuss options for Parent Allies at the sites - how much additional support could Parents for Parents provide, without additional funding?

- iv. Consider options for Family First funding and how it can be used in communities
    - 1. Including: engaging Perigee regarding opportunities for trainings related to infant-child mental health
    - b. Review the federal funding options document and report back with questions
    - c. Identify further data needs and/or asks from other workgroups
- 

### **UPCOMING EVENTS**

- 1. Design Team Meeting II: Monday May 18, 10:00 - 11:30 a.m.
- 2. Safe Babies Court Team™ 101 Webinar: Wednesday May 20 11:00 - 12:30 p.m.

**Safe Babies Design Team  
State Team Workgroup Meeting  
May 6, 2020  
3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.**

*Minutes*

**Key Questions Raised:**

- What is the role of the State Team in launching implementation sites?
  - What are the needs of the state work?
  - What is the process of site identification and selection?
1. **Welcome.** Present at the meeting were Amelia Watson, Cindy Bricker, Darneshia Bell, Erinn Havig, Gina WasseMiller, Janie Huddleston, Jason Gortney, Jill Gresham, Justice Madsen, Karen Dinan, Kelly Warner-King, Kim Gilsdorf, Lisa LaGuardia, Michelle Williams, Morgan Silverman, and Tonia McClanahan.
  2. **Review of Core Principles.** Workgroup members reviewed the answers to the “Core Principles” from the first Design Team Meeting. These principles serve to help ground members on this work. No changes were made to the lists.
  3. **Role of State Level Support - What do we need to know?**
    - A recap of the legislative meeting was provided (*See Legislative Workgroup Meeting Minutes for details*). During the recap, the workgroup was informed of future funding challenges.
    - ZERO TO THREE emphasized that in addition to focusing on funding, it is critical to create a strong foundation to ensure sites are sustained. Such foundational pieces include establishing a clear mission and vision; identifying state and local level partners; identifying short term and long term outcomes; clear messaging; and creating a process to monitor continuous quality improvement.
    - ZERO TO THREE provided the Workgroup with an update on the HRSA funding (*See Funding Workgroup Meeting Minutes for details*). As a result of the new information, the group focused on questions such as:
      - What is the process of site identification and selection?
      - What would the role of the state team be in launching these sites?
    - The Workgroup discussed the process of site identification and selection. Among the counties that express interest in becoming an implementation site, there needs to be a balance between interest and need. Strong judicial

leadership is critical in the selection process. Communities with parent allies may be a priority. It was also suggested that in the selection process should look for counties with existing collaboration within the community. If three implementation sites are selected, they could be three entirely different sites that are representative of different needs in the state.

- One member suggested that if multiple courts are identified, talking to entire teams in those areas can help measure buy-in and readiness.
- The Workgroup brainstormed the needs of the state work. Such included fidelity to the model, training support and coordination, and data collection. The Florida team was used as an example of an existing state team that performs these functions, and as suggested to use their approach as a reference during implementation strategy.
- The SBCT approach is a cultural shift. Communities of implementation sites need to have people who are willing to learn, as there is a learning curve.
- Communicating data is key in engaging courts and educating others of the opportunity. Data on dependency case filings, from DCYF, hospitals, and around substance use for pregnant women were mentioned as an effective way to educate and engage the community.
- Two individuals who were recommended to be in connection with were Judge van Doorninck and Joanne Moore. Judge van Doorninck is uniquely positioned to reach out to judges and members of the CCFC. Joanne Moore from OPD and OCLA has connections with parent attorneys and may have insight on which communities would have more buy-in over others.

#### **4. Wrap Up & Next Steps**

- Identify role(s) of state team and state level advisory board
- Explore organizational options for state team
- Identify tasks the state level team can do to prepare for the RFP
- Review Florida and Tennessee State Level Logic Models
  - What should a WA logic model include? What is missing? Who needs to be engaged?
- Develop stakeholder roster for Safe Babies advisory body

### **UPCOMING EVENTS**

1. Design Team Meeting II: Monday May 18, 10:00 - 11:30 a.m.
2. Safe Babies Court Team™ 101 Webinar: Wednesday May 20 11:00 - 12:30 p.m.



**Safe Babies Design Team  
State Team Workgroup Meeting  
May 7, 2020  
2:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.**

***Minutes***

***Key Questions Raised:***

- What should the SBCT sites' intake process look like?
- What information do we need to collect in order to start working with families?
- What are our data and evaluation objectives? What are we looking to measure?
- Once we take a look at the data, what are next steps to utilizing the data?
- Where are our data sources?

- 1. Welcome.** Present at this meeting were Morgan Silverman, Carl McCurley, Dorothy Gorder, Heather Cantemessa, Janie Huddleston, Julie Hoffman, Lois Martin, Michelle Williams, Shrounda Selivanoff, and Torey Silloway.
- 2. Review of Core Principles.** Workgroup members reviewed the answers to the "Core Principles" from the first Design Team Meeting. These principles serve to help ground members on this work. No changes were made to the lists.
- 3. Review of Current Data System**
  - a. Janie Huddleston and Torey Silloway provided an overview of ZERO TO THREE'S database. ZERO TO THREE uses a live data dashboard to collect and track real-time information. Data is collected at both the child and parent level. A wide array of data is collected, including but not limited to the following: the number of placements a child experiences; length of stay in care; family engagement; frequency of child/parent contact, Family Team Meetings, and court hearings; and service referrals. Janie offered to share their full list of data elements to the group. Janie and Julie Hoffman also confirmed that data was collected on fathers as well, so long as they provided consent.
  - b. Julie shared the current Data System of the Best for Babies (B4B) Program. Nineteen families are currently in the database; because the program recently became a ZERO TO THREE site (fall of 2018), there have not yet been many outcomes to share or evaluate. As of now, they are inputting baseline information into the database. She expressed the need for a stronger intake process, and highlighted that they cannot begin working with families

until they are involved in the dependency court. This has been a barrier, for it could take months before the program could begin working with the family.

- c. Julie also shared that the program has experienced issues around its messaging. Many viewed B4B as a “fast track” to reunification or adoptions. She emphasized the need to move away from language that would lead to this perception.
- d. Heather Cantemessa asked how long families are being tracked once the case closes. Julie answered that they do not track families after the cases close; families are tracked from when they opt into the program, until it ends. However, many parents request access to resources after the program ends, and that door is kept open. Janie mentioned that a research study was recently completed that looked at families after case closure for twelve months. She will share the study to the group when it is released.
- e. Julie explained that as a Community Coordinator, she collects data largely from the Family Team Meetings, court proceedings, and Dependency Petitions. She mentioned that the lack of access to specific court data was a barrier, and there is often an added layer of asking another individual to retrieve information.

**4. Data and Research Objectives.** Morgan opened up discussion to brainstorm the Workgroup’s key objectives in collecting and measuring information.

- a. Members brainstormed the following questions pertaining to data and research objectives:
  - i. Who are the people that are being introduced to the program?
  - ii. Who is eligible to participate in the program; what are those demographics?
  - iii. How can we bring in people of color; why are they not coming into the program?
  - iv. How does the parent’s ACE scores relate to their experience/outcome? Is there enough time allowed for parents with significant trauma histories to engage in programs to support reunifying with their children?
  - v. What services are coming in at what time, and are parents completing those services?
  - vi. In what ways can we capture the importance of building relationships?
  - vii. In what ways can we measure parent well-being?
  - viii. In what ways can we measure if a parent’s cultural identity was affirmed or incorporated into the services provided?

- b. Carl McCurly explained that he shares data with DCYF, and can track information such as CPS data, court processes, and some outcomes such as termination of parental rights and adoption. He explained that data can be used at a case level, court level, evaluation, and state or oversight level. He expressed interest in the effectiveness of services provided to families, such as the kinds of services provided and level of engagement with those services. Measuring service effectiveness meant there needed to be an ongoing monitoring of services.
- c. Members highlighted the significance of creating a formal process for parents to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the SBCT approach and services that were provided. This could be done through a pre- and post-survey. Parents could reflect on questions such as, “What was missing in your experience with the SBCT?” or “What did you wish you would have known about the SBCT?” Janie mentioned that ZERO TO THREE has developed a parent survey form, and could share to the group if they are interested.
- d. Wrap Up & Next Steps**
  - i. ZTT will send their data elements to Carl and the team for review
  - ii. Suggested elements discussed during today’s meeting will be incorporated (if not already included)
  - iii. In-between meeting, workgroup members will review the data elements, and note what’s missing
  - iv. At the next workgroup meeting, topics will include:
    - 1. In reviewing data elements, what is missing and needs to be added?
    - 2. What data-collection and data-review best practices does this team want to ensure are included in the Implementation Plan?
      - a. In reviewing the data elements, which data points are most important in ensuring model fidelity?
    - 3. Should the ZTT database be utilized, or are there suggestions for other data collection methods?
    - 4. What training will need to occur with team members to ensure data collection is accurate and timely?
  - e. The group is encouraged to relay additional ideas, questions, and comments around data and evaluation to the CCYJ team, as well as what they would like to know from other Workgroups to inform their data and evaluation strategy. Julie will report on this meeting’s highlights to the Design Team Meeting on May 18.



## **UPCOMING EVENTS**

1. Design Team Meeting II: Monday May 18, 10:00 - 11:30 a.m.
2. Safe Babies Court Team™ 101 Webinar: Wednesday May 20 11:00 - 12:30 p.m.

**Safe Babies Design Team  
Local Implementation Workgroup Meeting  
May 13, 2020  
12:00 p.m. - 1:00 p.m.**

*Minutes*

**Key Questions Raised:**

- What are the criteria factors for site identification and selection?
- How do we leverage existing resources and partnerships, and not reinvent the wheel when doing this work?
- Are there opportunities to bring baby courts into other problem-solving courts (such as FTC or drug courts)?
- What are the aspects of the SBCT approach in which additional funding is absolutely needed?
- How will the community engagement and collaboration incorporate cultural humility and understanding as a continuum in the process?

- 1. Welcome.** Present at the meeting were Amelia Watson, Barbara Harris, Darneshia Bell, Erinn Havig, Gina WasseMiller, Judge Adams, Julie Hoffman, Katie Biron, Kelly Warner-King, Laurie Lippold, Lisa LaGuardia, Lisa Melvin, Michelle Williams, Morgan Silverman, Jill Murphy, Sally Mednansky, Shrounda Selivanoff, and Tonia McClanahan.
- 2. Review of Core Principles.** Workgroup members reviewed the answers to the “Core Principles” from the first Design Team Meeting. These principles serve to ground members throughout this work. No changes were made to the lists.
- 3. Overview of Current Funding Opportunities**
  1. A recap of the legislative meeting was provided (*See Legislative Workgroup Meeting Minutes for details*). During the recap, the workgroup was informed of future funding challenges.
  2. ZERO TO THREE provided an overview of the HRSA Funding (*See Funding Workgroup Meeting Minutes for details*).
  3. Concern was raised about the sustainability of the implementation plan. Implementation sites cannot solely rely on one year’s worth of HRSA funding given the financial challenges resulting from COVID-19. There needs to be an umbrella of funding support in place to support implementation. This lead to key questions:
    - a. How do we leverage existing partnerships?

- b. How do we make sure we aren't reinventing the wheel when doing this work?
  - c. Are there opportunities to bring baby courts into other problem-solving courts (such as FTC or drug courts)?
4. The group concluded that now is the time to create a robust implementation plan and begin engaging the community. The impacts of COVID-19 will push the group to identify and utilize resources, services, and funding already available.
5. One member mentioned that understanding the lessons learned from Pierce County's Best for Babies (B4B) Program would help shape the group's implementation strategy.

#### **4. Site Engagement.**

1. Members discussed the following factors need to be considered during the site identification and selection process:
  - a. Buy-in from the site and community (such as the local DCYF office)
  - b. Strong judicial support
  - c. Strong team support to provide supervision and training of partners
  - d. Strong oversight committee for support
  - e. Communities with the largest numbers for this target population
  - f. Culturally and geographically diverse
  - g. Selection is equitably reflective
  - h. Understanding of WA Data; where the outcomes are poor
  - i. Communities with varying access to resources (high/low)
  - j. Site readiness
  - k. Communities with parent allies
  - l. Identify at least one site with FRC/drug court interested in collaboration
  - m. Regions in which staff turnover in the dependency system is low
2. In identifying site identification and selection criteria, the following questions were raised:
  - a. Are there perceived barriers in any of these communities?
  - b. How will the community engagement and collaboration incorporate cultural humility and understanding as a continuum in the process?
3. ZERO TO THREE shared their site readiness assessment to the group. The measurement factors were based on the SBCT Core Components. It was recommended to assess three implementation sites before the application process to have a better understanding of the kinds of communities being represented.

4. The group discussed the approach of normalizing SBCT implementation as “a way things are done” rather than a specialty practice. When creating an implementation strategy, engaging with communities, and creating a sustainable pathway, the SBCT approach needs to be seen as “the way business is done.” A key question raised from this discussion was:
  - a. What are the aspects of the SBCT approach in which additional funding is absolutely needed, and what can be incorporated into courts now for the SBCT approach to start working on its own?

## **5. Wrap Up & Next Steps**

1. Begin identifying sites for SBCT outreach
    - a. Culminate a list of sites and their criteria before the next Workgroup meeting
  2. Create a list of site identification and selection criteria. To do this, utilizing the information gathered from the meeting discussion, and from the chat box, CCYJ staff will develop a list of “must includes” in our site selection criteria
    - a. That list will be reviewed and approved by the group, either via email or in the next Workgroup meeting
  3. Review data to identify communities most in need, based on number of dependencies, amount of resource, and other demographic factors.
    - a. CCYJ staff will pull data, and discuss with the Workgroup either via email or in the next workgroup meeting.
    - b. If sites or areas are identified, discuss outreach with Workgroup to determine best approaches
  4. Consider opportunities to for sites to complete ZTT’s Site Assessment process ahead of RFP in order to best identify sites prepared to adopt approach
  5. Identify further data needs and/or asks from other Workgroups
  6. Report Out at Design Team II
- 

## **UPCOMING EVENTS**

1. Design Team Meeting II: Monday May 18, 10:00 - 11:30 a.m.
2. Safe Babies Court Team™ 101 Webinar: Wednesday May 20 11:00 - 12:30 p.m.



**Safe Babies Design Team  
Messaging Workgroup Meeting  
May 14, 2020  
8:15 - 9:15 a.m.**

*Minutes*

***Key Questions Raised:***

- **What is our mission and core values?**
  - **Who is our target audience?**
  - **What are our key messaging points?**
  - **How will our message add value to the audience?**
1. **Welcome.** Present at this meeting were Rachel Sottile, Darneshia Bell, Jennifer Whitaker, Julie Fisher, Julie Hoffman, Katie Biron, Lisa Mansfield, Michelle Williams, Morgan Silverman, Nina Evers, Heather Cantemessa. Sally Mednansky, and Shrounda Selivanoff.
  2. **Review of Core Principles.** Workgroup members reviewed the answers to the “Core Principles” from the first Design Team Meeting. These principles serve to ground members throughout this work. No changes were made to the lists.
  3. **Role of Messaging Workgroup**
    - a. The Workgroup was prompted with key discussion questions, including the following:
      - i. Who is our audience?
      - ii. What value do we want to give in our message?
    - b. The Workgroup agreed that people who are motivated will engage in SBCT implementation. In communicating the message, the audience needs to take ownership of SBCT implementation and feel connected to it. It will be key to understand what our audience wants, and listen to their voices.
    - c. Key audiences identified were potential families, funders, policymakers and legislators, service providers, parent allies, caregivers, and internal SBCT teams. Messaging should be uniform, but tailored to specific audience groups.
    - d. Messaging should consider “What value do we want to be giving people?” ( “inspiration” was given as an example). The intent is to help the audience take ownership and become involved.
      - i. Can also include a call to action, and incorporate what we want others to do



- e. Representatives from the Best for Babies Program discussed lessons learned in their messaging experiences. The program no longer uses language to suggest that the SBCT approach provides a fast track to reunification or termination. Rather, the program is now messaged as a collaborative and more thoughtful approach. Best for Babies resources around messaging will be distributed to the Workgroup.
  - f. Core values mentioned include reunification, building relationships, and respecting culture. The importance of relationships and collaboration needs to be emphasized, especially between parents, caregivers, and the community. Parents have a voice in their case. We also need to be inclusive and respectful of the diverse cultures served throughout the entire SBCT messaging and implementation strategy.
  - g. The SBCT approach is a cultural shift for communities, parents, caregivers, and service providers. The messaging needs to help shift existing norms, promote change in practices and relationship building.
  - h. **Messaging Plan, Process, & Points:** The Workgroup brainstormed a list of priorities in planning and process for the next three months:
    - i. Reach out to communities and ask what they want or need to increase buy-in
    - ii. Create a clear mission and vision statement,
    - iii. The message adds value and a call to action, which helps shape ownership and connection for the audience
    - iv. Create a video(s) of parent allies or SBCT alumni to talk about the value of the SBCT approach
    - v. Increase engagement for various audiences
    - vi. Be inclusive, respectful, and engaging with communities of varying cultures
    - vii. Emphasize the need of relationship building and supports
    - viii. Highlight the benefits of Child-Parent Psychotherapy (CPP) and other services provided
4. **Wrap Up & Next Steps**
- a. Darneshia send videos of parents speaking to the benefits of the SBCT approach
  - b. Julie to send resources from Best for Babies related to language and messaging
  - c. Nina to provide a resource on guiding principles
  - d. Nina and Shrounda will report back to the design team



- e. CCYJ team will distribute a draft mission statement and values list and email to the Workgroup for feedback.
- f. CCYJ team will develop draft key talking points for identified groups (such as policy makers, parents, service providers, etc). Those points will be used as a springboard for other ideas during the next meeting, or via email feedback.
  - i. The talking points will incorporate the core values identified by the group, and noted above

### **UPCOMING EVENTS**

1. Design Team Meeting II: Monday May 18, 10:00 - 11:30 a.m.
2. Safe Babies Court Team™ 101 Webinar: Wednesday May 20 11:00 - 12:30 p.m.