

**NCFR Home Visiting Focus Group
NCFR Annual Conference 2017
November 16, 2017**

Type of Meeting: Group Meeting. Open to All Members

Presiders: Bridget Walsh, Ph.D., CFLE; Jennifer Mortensen, Ph.D., CFLE; Carla Peterson Ph.D.
Note Taker: Jennifer Mortensen

A. Introductions/Sign in

B. History: 2017 Year End Report Highlighted

- a. Focus group established in Summer 2017
- b. Survey captured information about members, strengths, goals, and diverse experiences with HV and FLE
- c. Agreement that chairs should do initial alignment of CUPID core competencies and FLE content areas

C. Current Goals

- a. Engaging with CUPID, a large group of scholars, to examine core competencies for home visitors who work with infants and toddlers and their families. NCFR members and CUPID will examine the competencies and FLE content areas to potentially refine university curricula to prepare the next generation of home visitors who will support families through primary and secondary prevention efforts.
- b. **Some background on CUPID from Carla:** members are currently from 25+ universities and make up scholars/professionals interested in the science of infant/toddler development, how to help practitioners understand infant/toddler development, and working with families working around the contexts of their infant/toddler. The impetus for CUPID was that ECE training programs tend to center on the PreK years. The goal is to make infant/toddler knowledge more distinct and critical to students' knowledge and experiences.
- c. **Members' comments about the state of home visiting (HV):**
 - i. Two focused branches of HV: maltreatment prevention and school readiness/literacy. Depending on the branch, you see differences in the goals of HV. Is the HVer there to judge or there to support? Sometimes the HVer is a mandated reporter, sometimes they are not. What is the level of prevention you are targeting?
 - ii. One of the most convincing findings from HV research is reduction child maltreatment, so it remains a large focus.
 - iii. Challenge with HVers as professionals is that they are rich in knowledge, but low in skill set to execute HVing visits. There are very few training programs that prepare HVers specifically. Many people are interested in teaching professionals, but home visiting is a different beast – not only do they have to be sensitive/responsive themselves, but they also have to recognize those

- qualities in the parent and know how to push and change the parents' own behavior. This is a different skill set that is not recognized or trained well.
- iv. Multiple members responded that their students report being underprepared and in shock of the situations they are in when they start conducting real home visits.
- v. Bridget reported similar experiences through her research project – this seems to open the door for advocating for different training. HVers should not be lumped with ECE teachers (as it often is); it is a totally different skill set and totally different context (home vs. classroom).
- vi. Some programs include trauma and self-care classes to better prepare HV professionals.

D. Draft of Alignment

a. General ideas:

- i. Young people need practice with skills also – not enough to have the content. They have to put it in place.
 - ii. Dawn Cassidy: the idea around FLE ethics is that they are reflected during education so you are prepared to handle situations ethically when they are in the field.
 - iii. What is the perspective here? Better training for students? Or getting HVers as CFLEs? What are the challenges – why another credential? HVers report anxiety about the exam (especially if they have been out of school for a while), their hours at work are maxed out – how are they supposed to take classes with no time?
 - iv. Member from Texas reports Texas state is supportive of CFLE. FLE professionals advocate for the position when agencies/politicians do now what it is or when it is left off job postings as a requirement.
 - v. Issues with recognizing credentials challenging across people and states.
 - vi. Dawn Cassidy's feedback – NCFR talking about developing new materials to promote FLE and the credential. Any FLE program can use it as a marketing tool recognizing that the default is for states/agencies to only recognize licensed mental health/social workers – they just need to hear about FLE. They just don't have awareness. New pieces will be developed in 2018.
- b. **Health and Safety:** Human Growth & Dev content area also fits with health education?
- c. **Reflective Practice:** Does FLE Methods help with how you model reflective practice? And different strategies to engage parents? Fam and Indiv in Soc Contexts and Internal Dynamics may also fit?
- d. **Understanding and Supporting Relationships:** Interpersonal Relationships also goes with knowledge of family systems? Parenting Edu and Guidance also goes with knowledge of family systems? Fam and Indiv in Soc Contexts maybe also goes with family systems? All topics in this domain are covered in Human Growth & Development.

- e. **Guiding Infant/Toddler Behavior:** Interpersonal Relationships goes with family conflict and helping parents guide children? *note taker missed a few comments here when trying to get the computer to work
- f. **Partnering with and Supporting Families:** Internal Dynamics goes with Knowledge areas? Parent Edu and Guidance goes with Skill areas? FLE Methodology also seems to cover Attitudes.
- g. This seems to be a common theme – FLE Methodology and Ethics should inform ALL Attitudes
- h. **Assessing Development, Learning and Environments:** HV measures may be covered by Internal Dynamics or Interpersonal Relationships? Would this be covered in a public polity class? Families and communities class? HV measures may be covered by FLE Methodology? Carla says that some of the HV measures are fairly new and are probably not routinely incorporated in college courses.
- i. Scott – the challenge is that we could probably rationalize most categories to fit. Should we be pulling back and reducing/streamlining rather than rationalizing all content areas? Dawn Cassidy – let’s think about the principles of FLE vs. the content areas. Are the Attitudes actually reflecting the principles of FLE (strengths-based, prevention, and education)? Carla – there is good alignment, but is it translating to teaching programs? Most practitioners are going to work with families that are connected to Hving programs. Best to not be naïve about HV programs. Students should be trained anyways. Dawn – do we need continuing education opportunities via NCFR? Training modules, etc.?
- j. Issues with teaching HV measurements/assessments. When are these measures being taught? Carla – child development assessment is taught in classes, then other HV assessments are taught on the job. Bridget – HVers seem burdened with assessments and if they are doing them correctly. This is important because assessments are often tied to their funding.
- k. **Diversity and Inclusion:** Internal Dynamics of Families covers Knowledge and Skills? Family Resource Management – because of focus on disability (these families need more resources/services)? FLE Methodology should be included for the Attitude of showing cultural respect (because it is how you are arranging your visits to be respectful of the audience)?
- l. **Professionalism:** Questions about what HV evidence means? (i.e., what evidence is there that different HV models are effective?) FLE Methodology should cover this because it is about evaluation.
- m. **Additional Competencies:** Carla – colleague Rachel Chazan-Cohen and her are trying to argue that no matter where professionals are working, you should be trying to facilitate healthy parent-child interactions (i.e., Attitude of supporting parenting efficacy).

E. Work plan for 2018

- a. First step is to take the feedback from this meeting and send copies out to members for further thoughts. Then we will decide what to officially share with CUPID. Members agree.

- b.** Any pressing aspirations for the group beyond alignment? Should we get feedback from a wider audience of family professionals?
 - i.** Member suggestion that it would be helpful to have exemplars of what each are dialing in to specifically. It would be helpful for a wider audience to have practical examples to make it more digestible for wider distribution.
 - ii.** Dawn Cassidy – NCFR is creating a system so that all focus groups will have access to discussion forums, so ideas can be shared. This goes in to effect 12/1. Dawn suggests that not all sections of NCFR would be interested in providing feedback, but certain sections could be targeted specifically for feedback.
 - iii.** FLE academic programs should be targeted. A “for your consideration” type of feedback to see how well their HV training program would be represented through this proposed model/alignment.
- c.** Bridget encourages members to reach out personally if they want to put their skills to use in the focus group in a more direct way.

F. Meeting Adjourned