

# Minutes of the Community Advisory Council Meeting

**January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2020 - 6:30pm-8:30pm**  
**Training Room**

**Community Members:** Veralyn Alleyne (Co-Chair), Leroy Clarke, Raphael Francis, Sandra Forsythe, Blessing Morka(absent), Karen Chen (new member) and Rene Whittaker (new member)

**Board Members:** Bryan Buttigieg, Aisha Delpeache, Elaine Forde

**Staff Members:** Rona Jualla van Oudenhoven (Co-Chair), Dawn Walcott-Parris, Steve Woodman

Item	Agenda Item	Item Discussion (if required)	Action / Decisions
1.	Welcome	Land Acknowledgement and CAC Statement	Land Acknowledgement and CAC Statement read at the beginning of the meeting.
2.	Approval of Agenda	The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm.	MOTION by Bryan and seconded by Raphael to accept the agenda dated January 13 <sup>th</sup> 2020. CARRIED
3.	Declarations of Conflict of Interest	There were no conflicts of interest declared.	No conflict of interest
4.	Introductions	New Community partners were introduced and welcomed to the Council by the Co-Chair. New members are: Rene Whittaker and Karen Chen. Rene recently completed her Masters in Sociology and is now embarking on her Ph. D studies. Karen works with the Ontario Government. (Veralyn to provide the biopic information here please)	
5.	Approval of Past Minutes	Request to have approval of Minutes deferred to February meeting to allow more time for the presentation.	Approval of the Minutes deferred to next meeting with the intention to attend to the approval of all outstanding minutes at the February meeting.
6.	Agency Update: CPIN Simulation (Amanda Colacicco)	A CPIN simulation exercise was conducted for staff so that they could become familiar with the manner in which information was captured and logged in the relevant Drop Boxes. Much of this exercise was to address the questions	Members of the Council found this exercise very helpful.

Item	Agenda Item	Item Discussion (if required)	Action / Decisions
	Questions	<p>arising over previous meetings around data capture and trite reporting. It was felt that this exercise would be helpful.</p> <p>Questions were asked around the design of CPIN and what means are available to capture categories not displayed on CPIN. Is there scope for narratives to be documented? If there is no alignment with the existing CPIN categories, is there anything that can be done? What could be different if the case is not recognized as one to be opened? Is it possible that a call can come in and not registered on CPIN?</p> <p>Who are Intake Workers whose task it is to document calls? It was answered that staff are all trained social workers who upon entering DCAS undergo rigorous training on ABR, Equity; clinical supervision. They are required to sit and write an exam that is set by the Province and if they are not highly experienced will work in consultation with supervisor.</p> <p>Questions around caller identity were raised. Callers may choose to remain anonymous and this may affect credibility of the call but in the main credibility is more reliant on the nature of the call than on the identity of the caller.</p> <p>Q: Who handles approvals? There are various levels of approvals. In Access is dependent on staff roles and the classification according to job functions and permissions within the system.</p> <p>Q: Does the system allow an audit trail? As if January 1<sup>st</sup> with the Part X – CPIN can access an audit trail. This is again governed by what we need to know and why.</p> <p>Questions of alerts: Currently alerts only exist on special files created so if someone other than the authorized person opens this file – the worker is sent an alert e-mail and can follow up.</p> <p>Information was shared as to how relationships are captured on CPIN between parent + child.</p>	<p>It was explained that this is possible after the relevant boxes were ticked but that in pulling statistics, this data is not reflected. It was noted that all cells that are potential referrals are logged in CPIN, not only the ones that are to be investigated. All calls are documented on CPIN.</p> <p>Amanda proceeded with the demo and the data entry – explaining the reason for the narrative with the Intake Questionnaire that allows for more comprehensive data-capture than is allowed with the Drop Box.</p> <p>Amanda spoke of how CPIN allows us to select racial identity. She drew attention to the white supremacy that is embedded in the process in that it uses White as central and the other categories include White + other and does not allow for multiple identities to be captured. She noted the limitations of this and cited the example that Black + Indigenous can never be a category that is captured. This of course skews the data, for example the infographics pulled for Building Bridges is not truly reflective of reality. A People Profile is created and we are able to go into a box and fill in this information but again statistically this cannot be captured. This is an area for advocacy.</p>

Item	Agenda Item	Item Discussion (if required)	Action / Decisions
		<p>The process was explained that when a file is open at Intake for a Child Abuse Registry check – a contact log is open. Then a decision is made to open an investigation.</p> <p>Q: Is there a way to query the system where certain calls coming from one source repeatedly? Is it possible to track referrals? Yes</p> <p>Q: When do we use the Equity Practices to educate our Referers? When do we engage with DSSB and the Police?</p> <p>Q: Do we have a CPIN Privacy Lead? The overall CPIN privacy issues are managed at Ministry level.</p>	<p>It was noted that this is done in several instances and joint talks and workshops; and efforts are being made to reach out to various schools. It was noted that as much as we are concerned about institutions we also need to target individual learning such as nurses and teachers. As CPIN evolves and considers these learnings, the process may improve and allow for a more just data capture. Amanda was congratulated on her presentation and thanked for her time.</p>
7.	Other Items	<p>It was announced with regret that the AOPDEI Manager is moving to the Netherlands and has accepted a position at a University there and will no longer be with the Council. Members expressed their gratitude to Rona and were sorry to see her leave. They were concerned that the momentum gained would be lost.</p>	<p>Rona gave the assurance that the momentum will not be lost, as some succession planning has taken place and there are many steps to facilitate the transition, including the enlisting of four AO Interns – two BSW and two MSW students.</p>
9.	Meeting Evaluation	<p>The meeting was assessed as being a good one.</p>	
9.	Adjournment	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 8:30pm.</p>	<p>MOTION by Leroy, seconded by Elaine to adjourn the meeting. CARRIED</p>