

MINUTES FROM CHILD WELFARE TRANSFORMATION DESIGN COMMITTEE
MEETING
SEPTEMBER 16 AND 17, 2009

Members Present: Susan Dreyfus, co-chair (Sept. 17 only); Catherine Lanham; Maureen McGrath; Nancy Foll; Sharon Osborne; Carole Holland (Sept. 16 only); Darcy Hancock; Nancy Sutton; Ken Nichols; Steve Hassett; Mary Armstrong; Charlotte McCullough; Mary Meinig; Judge Chris Wickham; Liz Mueller; Gwen Gua for Carleen Anderson; Gwendolyn Lawson Townsend; Marian Harris; Mark Courtney; Jeanine Livingston; Rebecca Peck for Henry Cagey; and Brenda Lopez

Staff Present: Julie Dunnington, POC; Jennifer Strus, Senate Human Services & Corrections Committee; Sydney Forrester, House Early Learning and Children's Services Committee

Others: Randy Hart, Interim Assistant Secretary, Children's Administration (CA), DSHS; Fred Wulczyn, Research Fellow, Chapin Hall; Rep. Ruth Kagi; Ian Grant, former foster youth

The first day of the meeting was devoted to presentations by various persons on the following topics:

- A legal, tribal court and Children's Administration overview of the child welfare system;
- Characteristics of the children in the child welfare system;
- An overview of outcomes;
- The services needed by families served in the child welfare system; and
- Performance-based contracting - what is it? How is it done?

The second day of the meeting was spent discussing the time-line for implementation of 2SHB 2106 put together by CA as well as other potential implementation issues.

Randy Hart, in explaining the time-line, stated that the agencies selected in the demonstration sites will need at least 6 months to start-up. At the same time, during the 6 month start-up time, CA takes down contracts in some areas as well as planning for taking down work that CA is currently performing in addition to building up relationships in the communities. CA will need to develop quality assurance, monitoring and feedback loops with new agencies. CA must use a Request for Proposals (RFP) for contracting according to state law. In order to comply with the time-line set out in statute, CA must know where the demonstration sites are to be located by December 2009. Between January and May of 2010, CA will need a lot of information about the model or models to be used so that they can begin the RFP process. The RFP development process will take about 6 months and would last until January 11, 2011. When CA is making decisions about the RFP state law requires that they quit talking to potential bidders about the process.

In January 2011, CA will release the RFP. The entire bidding process takes about 10 months. CA will announce the successful bidders in October 2011. Then there is the contract negotiation process followed by the supervising agency readiness period.

CA only has 15 months within which to convert its current contracts and some of the same contracting processes used for the demonstration sites will be in place for the conversion as well. CA needs to work with DSHS contracts office to make sure the processes run parallel and that CA looks for the same outcomes and uses the TDC for guidance on this.

Randy also explained the milestones listed in the time-line. Washington has a tight, prescriptive contract bidding process. Any minor variance in the process can cause bidders to appeal and those appeals can delay the entire process for long periods of time.

The start-up period would include the supervising agencies hiring staff, entering into sub-contracts to provide services for which CA has contracted. CA will work with supervising agencies on planned transition of cases and CA will end client services contracts in demonstration sites.

CA is starting the planning process now for taking down those services in the demonstration sites.

Regarding the conversion of current contracts to performance based contracts (PBC), DSHS has developed a cross departmental steering committee project team and has begun discussions of how to do the conversion.

The transition process will allow stakeholders a chance to provide input. The process for establishing PBCs will depend upon the scale of change in the contracts. From now until January 2011, PBCs in other parts of the state should have manageable set of systems and goals that are at least compatible with the greater work of the demonstration sites, reflect input from stakeholders, invest public resources in a thoughtful way, and build community resources. It will take thoughtful consideration to use this opportunity to offer the same sets of services and opportunities in rural areas that are offered in urban areas.

The process will have to be acceptable to the public and this is where partners will help CA. This is a community child welfare responsibility and not just something for the state alone to be responsible.

In May 2010, CA needs the following information from the TDC to meet the time-line in statute: outcomes; performance measures; measurement processes; the answers to legal issues regarding liability, insurance and responsibilities in court hearings; processes for sharing responsibilities between the public and private agencies and transferring responsibility to supervising agencies; federal funding issues; requirements regarding practice issues; and rate structure(s).

There is not room for failure here. TDC and CA need to take the experiences of other states like Kansas and Florida and learn from their mistakes.

CA needs to know the location of the demonstration sites and preliminary information on contract outcomes by December 2009. Discussions are ongoing about what model will be used in the conversion transition. CA wants to have similar models of service provision for both the conversion and the demonstration sites and the ability to drive and increase outcomes between the demonstration sites and the rest of the state. The reason for this is to avoid duplication of effort when the demonstration sites are put on-line. CA also wants to engage people in the process and some may not wish to if they know it will only last for 18 months.

Rep. Kagi commented that the issue of the timing of the transition to PBC not fitting with the timing of the demonstration sites is something that can be addressed in the trailer bill that the legislature will be doing next session to tweak the bill to make it more workable.

Mark Courtney indicated that there are several assumptions mentioned by Randy that he would question for the sake of discussion. One is the idea that CA would convert to PBCs upon consolidation of existing contracts only in areas outside the demonstration sites. There would be some challenges that would lead CA to do that but he is not sure that makes sense. One could make the argument that CA would want to do this everywhere in the state and the demonstration sites become something different given that already doing PBCs with the private sector. Other jurisdictions have done this.

Mark further indicated that it might make sense to create a contract process that is more flexible given the project. Might take the legislature to make changes or is this something over which the legislature has no control and this is the only way bidding can be undertaken in this state?

Susan Dreyfus stated that if what is being tested is community based organizations doing all child welfare services and if we have already altered who will be performing the services within that geographical through PBCs, then it seems the only thing pilot sites would be about is who's doing the court work, the case management work.

Susan indicated that because of budget constraints and the Governor's directive to be bold as a result, DSHS is looking at a managed care, risk-based approach where we say to a lead agency not under the pilot but under PBC conversion that we want you to create the right basket of services with accountability of walking side by side with CA case managers to put services in place to achieve the outcomes we are looking for. So instead of CA case managers having fewer contracts we would condense this down to much fewer contracts around outcomes and the ability of those agencies to work with case managers and families to put the right services in place at the right time. If we did that only in demonstration sites, the only thing we would be testing is who is doing case management work and she would hate to think that all the legislature was thinking in creating 2SHB2106 was who is going to do the work rather than who will bring more resources to the table to benefit children and families in this state. The Governor believes that this is the time to do something bold around performance based contracting and not just tinker around the edges and lower the number of contracts by a few hundred but do something really different in this area.

Charlotte Armstrong indicated that there is no simple and easy answer and she would tend to agree with Mark that going with that assumption is not necessarily a good thing. In any state that moves to a lead agency there are always contracts in place in the geographic area in which the agency goes in to become the lead agency. The lead agency in the demo sites needs to show what they will do differently to build on the performance based contracting that will have already been built in every community across the state by the time the demo sites go online. It needs to be clear in the procurement documents that if the lead agency model is used in the performance based contracting conversion that supervising agencies that are selected in the demo sites may need to renegotiate contracts with lead agencies in those sites. So what the state would be testing would not only be the single case management model but also an agency's management capability in managing resources and rewarding the agencies that get the best results for kids and families and keeping the network development (done by the lead agencies during the performance based contracting conversion) part of the contract and this development would not stay static.

Susan indicated that what she was hearing was that the group need not be as concerned about the location as they are in making sure in the procurement documents that it's real clear to whomever is selected as a lead agency in a demonstration site area that the oversight of that contract will transfer to a supervising agency if and when that occurs in that particular geographic area.

John Howell reminded the TDC that there will be a site selection advisory committee that will be formed to work with the issues just discussed. It is therefore important for the site selection committee to have the information it needs from CA to do its job as soon as possible.

Rebecca Peck pointed out that during the process envisioned by 2106, we will be redistributing the wealth from the urban areas to rural areas and some regions will lose things that other regions will gain. This is a good opportunity to rearrange contracts and get some services to underserved areas.

Randy indicated that this is a good time to address deficiencies in the way CA has allocated resources in the past and hopefully get more outcomes. There are two important dates - the July 1, 2012 date when the supervising agencies in the demo sites will provide all child welfare services and the January 1, 2011 date when current contracts need to be converted to PBC. The period of time between the two allows agencies to build up and in those areas CA plans to redistribute staff and transfer the cases to the supervising agencies. The cases are the children in care and their families and families receiving services. CA needs to make sure this transfer is seamless and nobody gets hurt in this process. The relationship between the state and the supervising agencies needs to be a good one so that the families receiving services end up in as good a position or a better position than they were the day before the transfer instead of a lot of questions.

With regard to the PBC conversion and the demo sites need to make sure that we instill a realistic perspective of the needs of children and their families and that factors such as poverty can impact permanency, safety and well-being. Public

resources need to be invested in a thoughtful and strategic way as well and that we build upon the work of the current staff and our tribal, community based services providers, advocacy organizations and other stakeholders to go forward rather than re-creating everything. We want good outcomes but this can't be done unless we expand the capacity of everyone around the state.

Mary Armstrong made a couple of comments about the transition phase in the timeline. Six months is not long enough and if there is any way to truncate the bidding process to give the transition phase 12 months, Mary would highly recommend it. How the transition happens at the two demo sites should be a local decision as to how exactly that transition is going to happen. The lead agency(s) and the supervising agency should work together to make the transition occur smoothly.

Randy recognized that some of the dates in the timeline were too fast to allow the work needed to be done to be done.

Nancy Foll asked how the selection of the demo sites is going to be made and who is making those selections. Randy indicated that the TDC is making the selection. Nancy indicated that making those selections in a 4 month time period would be difficult. Randy indicated that there is some room in this and that the draft timeline reflects CA's best estimate as of this date in order to meet the timelines laid out in 2SHB 2106.

Nancy Foll asked whether CA had given any thought to the use of a Request for Qualifications prior to a Request for Proposal. A discussion ensued about the uses and differences between an RFQ, and RFI and an RFP. The whole process should be locally driven and not a top down type of process.

Susan commented that Nancy's comments were appreciated. One of the things Susan appreciates about Washington is its commitment to evidence-based programs and it well known for this. If hypothetically, CA gets the word out on the street as to what it is trying to accomplish as to how it's supposed to be a critical resource to CA case managers in helping them to move cases along and how they share in those outcomes together and that entity is to put together that basket of services within that geographic area, how do people recommend that we make it real clear that there needs to be some evidence and some proof behind what they are proposing is needed as well as all what the CA staff has learned over the years as to what has worked and yet giving them that local necessary autonomy to say in addition to these few things we are saying we need here the local community may wish to bring other things to the table how would CA walk that walk down the middle to get at both ends of that?

Nancy Foll indicated that she did not think that requiring certain standards is the issue; it's how those standards get applied in that community. You need to find the provider that best meets the standards that have been set. The next question is are you going to bring the children to that provider or are you going to bring the provider to the child which is a big issue in rural areas. Nancy is concerned that the providers would have to renegotiate things if the provider is in an area which is selected to be a demo site.

Sharon Osborne commended CA for having the timeline to begin the discussion at the front end. The partnership between the private providers and CA that was discussed yesterday. The partnership really does involve, from the beginning, having conversations with the existing providers or potential providers including new providers or new configurations of providers, to agree on what the outcome should be. The providers must speak up and work with the department in helping to define what this new system will look like, especially as intended by the legislature in 2106 to continue to work with community-based providers. Sharon also asked how they are going to introduce these concepts, plans etc to the public and not just to the traditional social services providers but also to local government etc.

Mary Armstrong indicated that this needs to be a locally driven process and it needs to be the beginning of this public/private partnership. What we can do with the department is lay out requirements for the planning process and make sure it is locally driven and that parents, youth, foster parents as well as providers, local foundations and the business community are included. It needs to be a locally driven, community based process that determines the decisions for that community.

Nancy Sutton commented that she is listening to the various comments and thinking about the time that it takes to accomplish these tasks and looking at the timeline presented by CA and she is seeing that they don't really add up. The timelines are not set up in the way that the consultants indicated they should be to be doing our work. The structures we have in place for the competitive bidding process may not be lined up for the quality and comprehensiveness of the work that needs to be done. Nancy mentioned that Florida used a different procurement process than what is proposed by CA in the timeline; not sure if the Florida method is more like an RFQ process than an RFP process. It might be helpful to have some legal consultation from the AG's office about what could be done, new and different, to shorten the 16 month chunk of time where we are assessing the proposals because we are spending a lot more time in the assessment phase than we are in the community development conversation phase and that seems out of sync and balance.

Jeanine Livingston indicated that she agreed that we need to engage the community and the partners but is thinking about the timeline and the legislative mandate that says you must do all of these things and you must do it by a particular date. Jeanine stated that she likes the RFI process and would like to see the committee explore this to at least identify the communities that are interested in being demo sites. It seems backward for us to select the sites based upon our preferences within this group and not consult the communities first. The RFI process would require less scoping than the RFQ or RFP processes. She is concerned about the timeline and engaging the communities because in the research she has done she has found that it is absolutely critical to engage the communities. And the timeline as presented today does not provide us the luxury of engaging the communities.

Charlotte Armstrong commented that one of the things that Florida did really well after their initial implementation was to require the development of alliances. These

alliances were comprised of every public agency (mental health, substance abuse, domestic violence, child welfare) local funders, private providers across the state, GALs, schools - broad-based representation in each community. Prior to the release of the procurement documents, the alliance came together to determine what their priorities were, what they wanted to do differently in the state, do they know what their statewide mandate is for having performance based contracts and demo sites? They had a very long implementation period and did not try to roll out the entire state at one time. After they gathered all the info they needed the procurement process was closed and the community selected the successful bidders and participated in the development of the implementation. At the time people thought this was one more layer that was going to be crazy but bringing all the people together it really helped to make sure there was ownership at the community level and that the focus was accessing resources both public and private. Taking this approach would slow things down a bit but in Florida the actual dates for implementation were changed about 3 times. The important message that Washington should heed is take your time and get it right rather than live with the regret and trying to fix what gets screwed up because we are watching the clock.

Rep. Kagi pointed out that, under the legislation, the TDC is to report quarterly to the Legislative Children's Oversight Committee. She encouraged the TDC to make recommendations for legislative fixes that they think are necessary so that those can be acted upon during the 2010 legislative session.

Steve Hassett indicated he would ask the Attorney General's office to designate a contracts expert to assist the TDC in understanding the contracting process in this state. He also expressed concern about the short time period during which the site selection advisory committee must work to select the demo sites.

Susan emphasized that in the demo sites where there are currently CA employees working, there needs to be a phase in because the demo won't be done with new and additional dollars but there is an assumption of the dollars that CA will drive out of the system and drive into the private agencies because the private agencies' biggest expenditure is their staff. We need not to lose sight of this issue in reviewing this timeline. Randy agree that we are talking about taking down CA positions in the demo sites while building up the capacity of private providers to assume the work.

Jennifer and Julie discussed the written report that will be prepared for the Children's Legislative Oversight Committee hearing on October 1, 2009. The draft report will be circulated to TDC members for their comment prior to the report being finalized. Julie and Jennifer emphasized that there will be a fairly short turnaround time within which to make comments. The first report will be largely devoted to process with the exception of any comments the TDC wishes to make regarding timing issues.

Nancy Sutton indicated that the TDC needs to have a very frank discussion about how they are going to meet the timelines set out by CA. Nancy indicated that she is concerned because the TDC is already not going to be able to meet the timeline in spite of the TDC's best efforts.

Jeanine Livingston also expressed her concern that the TDC's next meeting is not until December and the next meeting of the Legislative Children's Oversight

Committee (LCOC) is in early December. If the TDC is going to make recommendations for legislative change, she doesn't know that the TDC has adequate time before the Oversight Committee meets to make those recommendations so the TDC might want to consider another teleconference before early December then the TDC would be in a better place to make those recommendations.

Steve Hassett indicated that he would like the TDC to make a much stronger statement that the timeline is unrealistic and that there is a significant probability of getting the process off on the wrong foot. A strong statement to this effect should be in the report of the TDC to the LCOC. Everyone needs to be put on notice now that 2 months for site selection is simply not enough particularly if the intent is to involve stakeholders. If the intent is to do a top down site selection then maybe it can be done in the time allotted in the timeline but Steve does not think anyone on the TDC is seriously considering that approach.

Mark Courtney pointed out that the reason the timeline indicates that the site selection advisory committee must make its selection by the end of the year has to do with the contracting provisions that must be followed. Mark stated that he feels very comfortable saying that the consequences of the deadline in the legislation around PBC were not clear to the legislature or anyone else when they made that decision and now that we are getting into it, it's quite clear that that is an unrealistic deadline and it has implications for everything else we are trying to do here and not just the department's implementation of PBC.

Randy Hart indicated that the crunch is most immediate with the conversion of the contracts to PBCs. The timeline is the one that is worked backwards from the legislative deadlines under the current restrictions on contracting out. Randy agreed that the timeline is very tight unless there is a change in the process and that's what they wanted to show everyone today. If there is going to be more than an autocratic decision in picking the demo sites then they cannot do it by January 1st of 2011. CA will go back and continue its discussions around the PBC conversion timeline.

Susan Dreyfus stated that before the TDC decides it cannot hold to the legislative deadlines, she thinks if you take out that location determination for demo sites and you take us from October through May or June of 2010 for the community process that we want to have and I really do think that we should go for the creativity and out of the box thinking about a collapsed process that includes RFI, RFQ, RFP process that truly can streamline that process for us and just the RFI process, and taking the consultant's comments about the alliances that need to be a part and parcel of all of this, it really could be an exciting and dynamic process that is buying us ownership and participation all the way through. So before we decide that July 11, 2012 cannot work, she thinks we ought to go back to the drawing board and think differently about a way we collapse that work with the idea that the whole process is about inclusion and building community support and participation. She thinks the legislature would be open to the TDC thinking creatively and how we might model things in a different way in which the state would think about the procurement process.

Charlotte McCullough asked Susan if what she meant by her comments was to remove the problematic date of December 2009 until the end of May 2010 to make decisions so that allows from now until May to figure out what is that process that we will go out to all the communities with messages and comment seeking their interest, understanding having them begin to figure out how they are going to meet and then we will bubble up an appropriate procurement process for those that are interested in moving forward.

Susan indicated that it is both. If you look at where we are now to where we believe we want to be to give the supervising agencies more time - I know we are hearing a year but let's just sit down and talk about that. I don't think there is any one way to do this but if we look at the process - and we want to give the agencies at least 10 months to get geared up and implement. Can we create a process here? But I don't think I am saying that between now and May we are just going to sit and plan for the community participation. I think we have to get that started and getting the community going in this RFI process gets them all ready - having local meetings, getting stakeholders involved.

Charlotte indicated that she thought CA should not call the process an RFI at this point because the agency has not explored the universe of ways you communicate and I think you need to look closely at what your procurement will allow. There are things simpler than an RFI in terms of beginning to generate that kind of community dialogue and involvement. This needs to start now if we wanted to have those final decisions done sometime near the end of June or early July. That process of communication and engagement needs to be happening very soon.

Susan responded that we need to get the evaluators involved. We need to get them to the table with us in this decision making. We need to communicate to the communities what a site looks like from an evaluation standpoint.

Jeanine indicated that she liked the RFI process because it only requires a general scope and she doubts that in either the public or private communities there aren't those who have looked at or determined their level of interest in participating in this. It wouldn't be all that hard to find out who is interested and where. This information is critical in the decision in identifying demo sites. It's pointless for us to say we want to do this in this location if none of the private agencies is interested in participating. To know who is interested in what locations is critical to our decision making ability. It also allows us to predetermine in what locations who is eligible so they can start looking at transition issues because there's no way to transition in 6 months with all that has to be done - Famlink, training. If we can identify site locations and get a general idea of who is interested and at what level then we can start looking at transition issues and training needs.

John Howell indicated that there seemed to be agreement on the initial three proposed statements with the addition or the modification that Steve suggested about making a stronger statement about the upfront time - that 2 and a half months and deciding on locations for the demo sites by the end of this year is not workable. John echoed Susan's statement that no procurement process is being decided upon - there might be procurement processes ideas that might work better and those ideas need to be explored as part of this timeline and still the comment

that the 6 month period at the back end is in the TDC's view too short of a time to accomplish a satisfactory transition.

Susan stated in response to John's statement that determining the sites for the demo sites by December 2009 is off the table. I think because of what the committee said today we were under the assumption that we needed to select the demo sites in order to move forward with performance based contracting and what we are hearing is go ahead, move forward statewide but make it clear in that procurement that if in the area that you are serving is part of a demo site the supervision of your contract is going to change. The other thing I heard this committee advise is to let the process help determine the sites not determine the sites and have a process. I think we are absolutely clear on that as a department.

Mark Courtney indicated that he is glad that the three things are there, the first being that we think that the deadline the legislation imposes upon the department to convert all its contracts to PBC by January 2011 is unrealistic. Mark agrees that it is unrealistic. And even if we stick with the December 2009 deadline we still have the department saying we need contract outcomes and as a committee we need to help them determine what those outcomes are. But if they have to have that done and worked out with existing contractors by the end of next year then the outcome advisory committee has some pretty heavy lifting during the next 2 and a half months.

Susan indicated that it seemed to her that if we are just going to tweak around the edges and take 1800 contracts and make them a few less add some outcomes, we are OK timeline-wise. What the Governor and I are suggesting is that it is time to do something bold and different that aligns us well to these principles that this group is talking about then to give us a little bit more time to engage the communities - this issue of moving to more of a managed care, case rate, outcome driven, risk sharing approach - this is very different from where we are today.

Sharon Osborne agreed that this is a critical issue to be advanced especially for all those stakeholders that we want to get involved in this because there is a lot of question about what is driving the process. Is it the performance-based contracting? Or is it a bold new initiative? This does confuse it in the general public's mind, particularly when you are talking about readiness of providers. Sharon would hope that the TDC would stay within the goals set out by the legislature but give the community providers some plan for how these demo sites fit together with the whole concept of PBC conversion. We need to elongate the timeline and that we look at that as we move through this process.

Charlotte indicated that what would be helpful as an outsider is to put together the timelines for both the PBC conversion and the demo site implementation. When we are talking about 1800 contracts, what is our actual vision? Do we really think you are going to regionally procure lead agencies that will create PBCs similar to what you had talked about for the demo sites? Are we trying to get the state to that place in a year? You can't get there from here if this is the plan. If you are talking about reassessing and realigning the services that you purchase and align them with what child and family needs are and what the outcome are then there is just worlds of work that needs to be done in all those areas we talked about yesterday in terms of

what services, for which kids? Are we going to buy differently? Organize differently? What kind of financial risk? Even to scale the 1800 contracts back what is the conversation that says what should take its place? And there are inequities like every other state in your geographic distribution of your current services and resources. Florida has had a fully implemented community-based system for 5 years and they still don't have equity in the allocation of resources and services across the state and they have been working hard to get there. So do we just take what we have now in the pots in which they currently exist and divide according to the regions as they currently are and that's what we are working from or are we going bolder and saying what we really need to do differently? Charlotte doesn't know if the timelines are too short until those conversations are clearer and she is not sure how this committee relates to the cross-service steering committee in DSHS that Randy talked about that is looking at the PBC conversion. If there is some way to put the planning together between this group and our advisory committees to come up with overlapping timelines that get us to where we are trying to go for both then she thinks we can make some rational decisions about what to recommend in terms of changes. She agrees with the direction we are going for the demo sites but doesn't know if we have enough information to say what is needed on the PBC conversion side.

Susan indicated that the project management teams that she has asked for in the department are for the heavy lifting we have to do. The department has an incredible amount of work that has to be done and once the guidance is given to the department - then this is how we will internally manage this across the department to put together the limited resource pool we have to pull this off. If we are talking about participation of the subcommittees and looking at PBC in the way in which our Governor is wanting to support which is a bolder approach then we would probably be better off if we had a little bit more time than trying to pull this off by January 1, 2011. But that is a legislative decision and right now we have to follow the law and that is what the law currently directs us to do.

Charlotte asked whether if the department goes with a bolder approach wouldn't that require an RFP and a procurement because can't get from 1800 contracts to that goal. A lot of the area where the clock gets eaten up is in the different types of procurement and that is true for both PBC and demo site implementation. Need to lay both out so we can see what it looks like for the state and how would the procurement work.

John Howell indicated that the items Charlotte and Susan were discussing were really in the purview of the advisory committees to wrestle with. While there are strong feelings about the timelines required in statute there is no consensus at the moment although there has been a lot of concern expressed. John indicated that it really is up to the Site Selection and Transition Advisory Committee to recommend to the TDC whether any legislatively set deadlines should be changed.

The TDC took public comment.

After the public comment period, Susan indicated that the legislation calls for the Asst. Secretary for the Children's Administration to be a co-chair of the TDC and that she will be working with staff to make sure that transition occurs. Susan also

pointed out that she has a passion and commitment to child welfare so she will be staying very close to this process and will be briefed regularly.