

# APPROACHING CQI FROM THE INSIDE OUT

The New York Foundling

Rosemary Collazo, Arleny Henriquez, Suzie Choi, Brian Nguyen, Diana Salazar

CQI Conference | 2023: CQI is a Journey, Not a Destination

*Check the Whova App  
for a word cloud  
activity!*



# Uthovva

Word Cloud: In one word describe what makes it difficult for you to discuss data?



# Agenda

- Introductions- 2 minutes
- Session Goal – 1 minute
- Data Emotions – 5 minutes
- Collaborative Session – 15 minutes
- Report Out – 25 minutes
- Poll & Word Cloud – 5 minutes

The New York Foundling is built on a 150-year-old promise to our neighbors that all children, adults, and families can have the opportunity to reach their full potential. We are dedicated to effective, impactful interventions that are grounded in research and responsive to the cultures of the families and communities we serve. Our work encompasses five core service areas: child welfare, developmental disabilities, education, health and behavioral health, and juvenile and criminal justice.



# Program Quality Analyst Team

**Suzie Choi**

*Program Quality Analyst*

**Rosemary Collazo**

*Vice President*

**Arleny Henriquez**

*CQI Director*

**Brian Nguyen**

*Program Quality Analyst*

**Diana Salazar**

*Program Quality Analyst*

**Special Guest:**

Raquel Vargas

*Program Quality Analyst*

# Session Goal

To develop strategies to improve **methods of engagement** that create a culture that promotes **empathy driven data analysis** to each of the five emotions or reactions to data.

*\*Collaborative Session (and report out)*



# Joy

Someone who approaches data and CQI with **happy talk** – bad data is because of **outliers, case by case basis, it will be fine**. Very **surface level** assessments without looking at trends or is a “yes” person.

These are the Happy Talkers



# Sadness

Someone who looks at data as only something to be upset about, **woe is me, there is nothing we can do to change** these numbers, why do we even try.



These are the Debby Downers.



# Fear

Someone who sees the CQI process as solely **punitive**. They are **afraid** to look at their numbers because they think it will only tell them bad things. They have had a **negative experience** with management by data in the past. They feel like their **jobs are on the line** for each and every metric.

These are the Scaredy Cats.



# Anger

Someone who places **external blame** on factors outside of their control for their data. This person may blame the “system” for poor outcomes, stakeholders for low referrals and utilization, and “lazy workers” for low productivity measures such as timeliness. They **struggle to take accountability** for the things in their circle of control, so their CQI conversations are ***negative and blaming***.

These are the Negative Nancys.



# Disgust

Someone who literally **rolls their eyes** when you utter the first syllable of data or CQI. They **do not see the point** of looking at their data because they “know their cases” and do not engage in meaningful conversations about trends or interventions. This person is also **extremely distrustful** of any “report” that is presented to them.

These are the Data Deniers.



*Post any questions you have  
in the Whova app!*

# Collaborative Session

15 Minutes



Report Out

# Joy- The Happy Talkers

*Joy would say:*

- “This usually doesn’t happen.”
- “My team is meeting all expectations.” (without concrete examples)
- “This person just had a bad month, it won’t happen again.” (third month in a row)



***How would you handle this?***

# "Happy Talkers": Joy

## NYF PQA Team Approach

- Asking them where they need to improve first before giving them your assessment
- Bring in the trend overtime- show them that the “outliers” have become the norm
- “As the expert in your model/work/team I need your assessments and interventions on this trend”



# Sadness- The Debby Downers

*Sadness would say:*

- “These expectations are unattainable; we will never meet them.”
- “There is no point in coming up with new interventions, they won’t work.”
- “We tried everything.”

***How would you handle this?***





# Sadness- NYF PQA Team Approach

- Strength based language – empower and build up
- Doing a strengths assessment in the moment looking at all the contributing factors based on one strong metric or improvement in the data (no matter how small)
- Ask them about their interventions and what they are doing differently, point out that they will see the result later



# Fear- The Scaredy Cats

*Fear would say:*

- “I hope I don’t get fired the numbers are so bad.”
- “There is no point in assessments or interventions, it’s all my fault.”
- “Data never works for me, it just makes me look bad.”

***How would you handle this?***





# Fear- NYF PQA Team Approach

- Therapeutic approach: Purpose, Acceptance, & Safety
- How do we make people feel safe in the data discussion
- Make sure they know they are not alone- support from leadership, peers, QA/QI staff
- Reframe the fear - i understand that you are trying to protect yourself and your team and this process is designed to help your team improve

# Anger- The Negative Nancys

*Anger would say:*

- “This report is wrong- my numbers look different.”
- “If my team just did their job, we wouldn’t be here.”
- “You don’t understand, these expectations are unattainable.”

***How would you handle this?***



# Anger- NYF PQA Team Approach

- Call it out directly – when you say that I hear you are being defensive about this data and conversation – what is behind that?
- Empathize and let them “be in their feelings” for a minute – focus on what they can control. As long as you are trying your best, we cannot ask for more
- “Anger is just depression turned outward” - give them a sense of control over the situation and ask for their concrete interventions



# Disgust- The Data Deniers

*Disgust would say:*

- “What is the point of this meeting? I know my cases.”
- “Are you sure this data is right? (eye roll)”
- “This metric isn’t even related to my team’s work.”

***How would you handle this?***



# Disgust- NYF PQA Team Approach

- Relate the data to the clients - “this data represents people’s lives” - this process allows us to take a 10,000 foot view to ensure families get the best services
- We are all coming to the table with knowledge, giving space for their knowledge AND space for QA/QI expertise in the process
- You may know your cases, but our stakeholders and funders only see these numbers – your input, assessments, and interventions are vital
  - The process of CQI and improvement is important because funders look at performance and we don’t do this for free



# Universal Approaches

- Starting with a check in (highs/low, rosebud/thorn)
- Validating the emotion so that they feel heard
- Sandwich Statements
  - (Positive – Feedback – Positive)
- **\*\*Relationship building\*\***
  - use every opportunity to add to the “bank account”
- Check your bias - people's response to you will very much depend on ***your response to them***



# Ulhova

Poll: Which Emotion is the hardest to work with?



# Ukhova

Word Cloud: What emotions do you have while presenting/putting together/ discussing data ?





Thank you!

[PQAteam@nyfoundling.org](mailto:PQAteam@nyfoundling.org)

