



## Ohio Kinship and Adoption Navigator (OhioKAN) Development Project

Stakeholder Workgroup: Session 2 of 3  
June 17, 2019

### “SERVICE” Breakout – Meeting Minutes

#### KINNECT FACILITATORS

Bob Friend, Jamole Callahan and Sarah Kaye (with Roxana Bell)

#### INTRODUCTIONS

1. The facilitators introduced themselves and clarified the goal of the 2 breakout session.
2. The facilitators led the group through the 2 breakout sessions.

#### Service Breakout: Session #1

**\*\*The subcommittee broke into four groups to discuss structure:**

<b>How many regions should Ohio be divided into?</b> <i>**Using sample 10-Region and 12-Region maps as a guide</i>			
Group #1	Group #2	Group #3	Group #4
Consensus: 12 regions	Consensus: 12 regions	Consensus: Split (10 or 12 regions)	Consensus: 12 regions
Thoughts driving decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large Metro areas may be sucking up resources for rural areas</li> <li>People from rural areas are already driving to larger Metro areas for services</li> <li>12 may be more accessible than 10</li> <li>Con for 12 counties may be that SW counties are stretched thin</li> <li>Might need to redraw 12 regions to create equitable distribution for SW counties</li> </ul>			

<b>Where should Regional Hubs be located?</b> <i>**Using sample 10-Region and 12-Region maps as a guide</i>			
Group #1	Group #2	Group #3	Group #4
Athens Summit Hamilton Montgomery Allen Wood Franklin Lucas Cuyahoga	Montgomery Clark Richland Franklin Hamilton Athens or Fairfield Muskingum Lorain Cuyahoga Ashtabula	Stark Franklin Muskingum Richland Fairfield Athens Hamilton Lucas Lorain Montgomery	Lucas Hamilton Richland Ashtabula Montgomery Franklin Lorain Summit Muskingum

**Which potential structure options seems to work best for OhioKAN?**  
*\*\*Using 3 sample program structure options as a guide*

<b>Group #1</b>	<b>Group #2</b>	<b>Group #3</b>	<b>Group #4</b>
<p>Consensus: Split Version 1 or Version 2</p> <p>Version 1: seems stronger, as 1 person responsible for each area</p> <p>Version 2: fiscally sound</p>	<p>Consensus: Version 1</p> <p>Version 1: “more is better”</p>	<p>Consensus: Split Version 1 or Version 2</p> <p>Version 1: ideal world</p> <p>Version 2: consistency; fiscally sound</p>	<p>Consensus: Split Version 1 or Version 2</p> <p>Version 1: ideal world</p> <p>Version 2: fiscally sound</p>

**Takeaways from Session #1:**

- No consensus on # of regions
- Need more equitable distribution of regions especially for SE Ohio counties
- More data is needed to determine structure
  - Census 2020 data for kinship providers
  - SACWIS and other juvenile court data
- Flexibility in regional structure will be important
- Voices from educational community are needed
- Who are the managers? Are they social workers? Are they Caregivers?

**Service Breakout: Session #2**

**\*\*The subcommittee broke into 3 groups to discuss Service Tiers and Key Program Components**

<b>Group #1: Inform (Information, Referral)</b>
<p><b>Possible Line Items:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 211</li> <li>• Website outreach</li> <li>• Information</li> <li>• Referrals</li> </ul>
<p><b>Takeaways from group:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreach and Word-of-Mouth is imperative</li> <li>• Educate/outreach to legal community</li> <li>• Outreach ideas: Lunch and Learns (in-person) and updated website</li> <li>• Social Media tie-ins (i.e. National Adoption and Kinship Month)</li> <li>• Untapped resource: churches and faith communities</li> <li>• Community Mapping for existing and new sites</li> <li>• Language matters: standardized definitions (accessible)</li> <li>• Large community businesses could be resources</li> </ul>

## Group #2: Connect (Networking, Hard Services, Support Groups)

### Possible Line Items:

- Community networking
- Linking to community providers
- Respite
- Mental health services
- Hard goods (cribs, beds, car seats, school supplies, etc)
- Support groups
- Resource groups
- Training opportunities

### Takeaways from group:

- Values/curriculum building/consistency
- Regional Approach to learning communities (navigators and directors)
- Kin/adopt- IV-E eligibility, build community, peer led programming
- Building therapists who are trained in each topic area
- Navigator → follow-up and feedback loop

## Group #3: Support (Assessment, Case Management)

### Possible Line Items:

- Full Assessment
- Case Management Services (per hour? Per visit?)

### Takeaways from group:

- Pre-existing training for less advanced counties
- Use technology for learning communities (“real-time” FB message board)
- Intensive Services (ombudsman? Case worker?)
- Move from linkage to case management
- How to leverage sites already doing well? (Ohio Grandparent Coalition)
- Community and region 1 learning from region 2? (provide training and development)

### Existing and New Sites Discussion:

- Leverage what already exists via Learning Communities
- Importance of navigators being able to access current data
- Learning variation in courts
- Richland and other current counties with kinship navigators can serve as regional HUBs
  - We can go to those counties
  - Survey current services
  - Information gathering and building up network
  - Community Mapping (low resourced vs. high resourced)