



COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES
SURROUNDING THE DEATH OF PHOENIX SINCLAIR

Commission Disclosure 0985

Manitoba



Family Services

Child and Family Support

2nd Floor - Suite 201
114 Garry Street
Winnipeg MB R3C 4V5
CANADA

(204) 945-6984
FAX: (204) 945-6717

May 26, 1999

Ms. Glenda Edwards
Acting Area Director
Winnipeg Child and Family
Services - Central Area
2nd floor, 831 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg MB R3G 0N6

Dear Ms. Edwards:

Re: Case Management Standards Package

Further to our meetings and discussions, enclosed please find the most recent version of the Case Management Standards package. It includes:

- the complete narrative, edited to align with the forms package (Note: These edits have been shaded in this draft);
- an extensive revision to the forms that were previously circulated; and
- a draft manual describing the forms and guidelines for how some of the component parts may be applied.

Because you have not heard from me for several weeks, some explanation for this hiatus is indicated. Simply stated...developing and revising a useful form package that adequately and accurately describes the field experience as you have presented this has taken more time and effort than previously anticipated. You will note that the enclosed forms appear very different from the original draft. As per your advice, we have constructed the forms so they reflect actual activities associated with the case management process. Great care has been taken to ensure that information is collected only once and "moves" with the process as additional materials are gathered. As well, we have integrated the risk assessment process into the case management process. These elements are built into the various steps rather than relying on a free-standing risk assessment instrument. Finally, we made every effort to construct the new forms so that they will be compatible with the CFSIS application...as far as this is reasonable.

In short, we are suggesting that the "narrative" be accepted as is for the present and next step efforts be focused on ensuring that the forms and instruction components meet the needs for which they are designed. Later in this correspondence you will also see that we are suggesting it is now time to begin to consider the issue of workload impact and workload measurement.

.../2

- 2 -

Next Steps

The individual representatives that I have been working more closely with in recent months are as follows: Ms. Rhonda Warren, Ms. Darlene MacDonald, Ms. Glenda Edwards (Winnipeg Child and Family Services); Mr. Kenneth Knight (Child and Family Services of Western Manitoba); Ms. Emily Shane (Jewish Child and Family Services); Mr. Dennis Schellenberg (Child and Family Services of Central Manitoba); Ms. Carolyn Cannon (Churchill Health Centre); Ms. Madelaine Michaud, Ms. Gloria Lister and Ms. Sandra Lagimodiere (Southeast Child and Family Services). Mr. George Chigol and Mr. Tom Carberry have also represented Mr. Peter Latimer, Ms. Kathy Wightman and Mr. Al Curtis from Regional Operations.

These folks have assumed leadership roles in this process to ensure that feedback has been forthcoming from all fields/supervisory levels. In about two weeks (after you have a chance to review the materials and solicit feedback from local workgroups)...I will be in touch to set up a meeting and/or arrange another visit to the various sites. The purpose of this will be as follows:

- receive preliminary feedback on the revised form package;
- identify 3 or 4 sites so that the material can be "tested" at the field/supervisory level; and
- introduce the issue of workload measurement.

Test Sites

There is general agreement that the testing of the material should be supervised jointly by representatives from the above-sited working groups and a person or two from the Branch. Selecting the sites and the committee to oversee the experience also needs to be managed jointly. As well, the issue of "workload implications" has been raised throughout this standards implementation process. We have agreed to keep separate the development of case management standards and the impact these standards may have on workload. Now that we have a prototype that is ready to test...it is now time to begin thinking about workload measurement.

Workload Implications/Workload Measures

I am suggesting that...concurrent with the testing...that we begin to identify the ingredients or components of workload measurement. Simply taking a "before and after" approach to the test will not suffice because we do not yet have an agreement on what constitutes a useful workload measurement. This varies from agency to agency...and in some cases from unit to unit within a given agency.

Therefore it is important and timely that we use the next steps in the case management implementation process to begin to identify the items that describe workload from a field and supervisory prospective. (Example: case loads size, case complexity, travel vagaries, number of staff supervised, etc.)

- 3 -

In the past, considerable work has been undertaken in this area but it has been idiosyncratic. I am suggesting that the standards implementation committee (described in greater detail in subsequent section of this correspondence) take responsibility for initiating this process. The goal for this exercise will be to construct an approach to workload measurement that has acceptance by all agencies delivering child and family services (as this pertains to the case management standards) and the funding authority.

Use of Manual

The revised package contains a manual which suggest how the various forms should be used. In your review, please pay special attention to ensure the instructions are 'congruent' with the forms.

If you have any questions please contact me at 945-3995 or 791-8024.

Sincerely,



Richard Voss
Team Leader
Services to Public and Community

RV/ch
Enclosure

WFOUVCASDMDLWFO