



**CHILD WELFARE TRANSFORMATION DESIGN COMMITTEE
THIRD QUARTERLY REPORT**

JANUARY - MARCH 2010

BRIEF SUMMARY OF CWTDC WORK
JUNE 2009 – JANUARY 2010

Background:

- The Child Welfare Transformation Design Committee's (CWTDC) responsibility is to make recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor regarding the use of performance-based contracts for the delivery of child welfare services and, in two demonstration sites, make recommendations regarding the transfer of child welfare responsibilities from the state Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) Children's Administration (CA) to private agencies.
- There are currently 24 members on the committee. (List is attached.) SSB6832 adds another member, a foster youth, to the membership of the committee to be effective in June 2010.
- Denise Revels Robinson, Assistant Secretary of the Children's Administration, and Judge Leonard Costello, retired, serve as co-chairs.
- The CWTDC is required to report quarterly to the Governor and the Legislative Children's Oversight Committee through December 2012, then twice a year through June 2015.

Summary of Accomplishments:

- The CWTDC named co-chairs; established a quarterly meeting schedule; and developed a timeline of important dates, as well as ground rules and guiding principles.
- Meetings of the CWTDC have been held on June 30, 2009; a conference call on August 4, 2009; and meetings on September 16-17, 2009 and December 14-15, 2009. Committee attendance has been good with only one member missing each meeting. Members not in attendance have designated an alternate to attend in their place. Stakeholder turnout has been very strong.
- Four advisory subcommittees have been established to research, review, and analyze the committee's areas of focus and then bring recommendations to the full committee for consideration. The Advisory Committee co-chairs have begun meeting monthly with the CWTDC co-

chairs to review agendas and amend areas of focus, as appropriate. The Advisory Committees include the Advisory Committee on Legal and Practice Issues, Advisory Committee on Outcomes and Evaluation Issues, Advisory Committee on Financial Issues, and Advisory Committee on Selection of Demonstration Sites and Transition Issues. Since their initial establishment, each committee has added members to gain broader perspectives and ensure that all stakeholder voices are included. Advisory Committee agendas and minutes can be found on the CWTDC website at www.joinhandsforchildren.org.

- The CWTDC has ensured full and complete transparency by publishing public notices; holding public meetings with opportunities for public comment; posting all meeting agendas and minutes, as well as inviting questions to be asked and answered on the CWTDC website.
- The CWTDC and the DSHS continue to work in a cooperative, collaborative manner to share ideas and information on an ongoing basis.

January Recommendations:

In January, the CWTDC made recommendations to the Legislative Children's Oversight Committee. These were:

- That a foster youth be included on the CWTDC as a full member.
- That the deadline by which DSHS CA must convert current contracts to performance-based contracts be extended six months to July 2, 2011.
- That the evaluation methodology used by WSIPP to evaluate the demonstration site implementation be random assignment.
- That supervising agencies be allowed a six-month phase-in of service delivery in the demonstration sites.
- That the evaluation period for the WSIPP be extended to three years.

Since that time, Substitute Senate Bill 6832 was passed and is awaiting the Governor's signature. SSB 6832 includes the first four recommendations. It was agreed that the fifth recommendation would be reviewed again after the demonstration site evaluation had been running a year. If it was discovered at that review that more time was needed, the extension could be granted.

MARCH 22-23, 2010 CWTDC MEETING

The fourth meeting of the CWTDC was held on March 22 and 23, 2010. ([Minutes](#) and [Agenda](#) attached.) The entire committee was present except for two IPAC members who were unable to attend. Alternates were sent in their place. There was also a strong turnout of stakeholders. Judge Leonard Costello and Assistant Secretary Denise Revels Robinson, co-chairs of the CWTDC, welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Judge Costello reviewed the agenda, which included a brief overview of SSB 6832, a presentation on lessons learned from other states implementing performance based contracting, an update on Phase I by Children's Administration, and Advisory Committee reports. Public comment was also taken each day. The meeting concluded with a discussion of next steps and questions/issues CWTDC members wanted included in the quarterly Legislative Children's Oversight Committee report.

Overview of SSB 6832

David del Villar Fox gave a brief overview of the bill and let the CWTDC know that the bill is currently awaiting the Governor's signature.

Lessons Learned – Other States' Experiences with Performance Based Contracting

Charlotte McCullough, one of the committee's performance based contracting (PBC) experts, [presented](#) similarities and differences between states; advantages and disadvantages of different types of PBC; challenges of PBC; what's working and what's not; and success factors and lessons learned. She also spent time describing different payment models as well as methods to build in incentive and penalty payments based on performance.

Charlotte was joined by Mary Armstrong, the second CWTDC performance based contracting expert, and Assistant Secretary Denise Revels Robinson for a question and answer period. After the discussion, Assistant Secretary Revels Robinson reflected on the conversation. She reinforced the importance of distinguishing between Phase I and II. Another theme she heard in the committee's discussion and strongly supported was the goal to "better serve children and families." She recognized the need to keep children safe, but wants to continue to improve on what we are doing well, while engaging community partners throughout. She added that DSHS CA is working on making internal changes, such as building infrastructure, capacity and competencies that don't currently exist today. She agreed that the issues around rates, incentives, and penalties are large and that DSHS CA will rely heavily on the Advisory Committee on Financial Issues for input. She added that all future agreements and contracts would have language that clearly supports and honors all federal mandates and federal government-to-government relationships with tribes. She wanted to underscore the word "share" because this process is about "collective" work and accountability.

Update on Phase I

Assistant Secretary Denise Revels Robinson followed by giving an update on DSHS CA's activities relating to Phase I. The [presentation](#) had a range of purposes: to revisit selected concepts; to report on communication efforts; to review of cornerstones of Phase I; to address frequently asked questions; to

provide further information; to solicit feedback; and, to provide some rumor control.

Assistant Secretary Denise Revels Robinson began the presentation by talking about the importance in creating a “continuum of care,” not just four service category bundles. She shared her hope that the community can collectively create the vision of a full continuum of care. With regard to the roles and responsibilities of the ‘master contractor,’ she wanted to make clear that these organizations have a higher degree of responsibility over sub-contracted agencies. She presented an overview of everything that DSHS CA is doing to maintain open communication networks with stakeholder communities. She explained that the goals of the DSHS CA communication campaign is to be “open, visible, to hear from people, but also to provide information to keep the dialogue open.” She also wanted to address the confusion over the number of master contractors that DSHS CA is hoping to consolidate to by the end of Phase I. Ideally, Assistant Secretary Denise Revels Robinson would want a single master contractor per region, but she understands that it may not be feasible to achieve that level of contract consolidation in the first round of contracting. At this point, DSHS CA is going to put out an RFP competitive process that is looking for quality, partnership, flexibility, an agency that can speak to the values that CA has laid out for children and families, an agency who can work with subcontractors, an agency that is committed to building capacity and improving services. DSHS CA will use an independent group to evaluate proposals to avoid any conflicts of interest. She wanted to assure all the committee members that CA will be transparent and visible in the procurement process and will adhere to all procurement guidelines.

Outcomes and Evaluations Issues Advisory Committee

Ken Nichols and Mark Courtney presented the report from the Advisory Committee on Outcomes and Evaluations Issues ([presentation](#) attached). Mark Courtney introduced the latest draft of outcomes to be used in Phase I and Phase II. The Advisory Committee is recommending that every measure be broken down by child age, race/ethnicity, and tribal affiliation. Mark explained that tracking outcomes by these measures is essential to address disproportionate involvement in the child welfare system of subpopulations defined by these characteristics. He also talked about the distinction between process and quality of care measures and how they relate to the outcome domain and indicator measures. He explained that it’s what one does (the process) and how well one does it (quality) that indicates whether one achieves what one sets out to accomplish (domain).

The CWTDC then voted to accept the Outcomes Advisory Committee’s document outlining their recommendations, *Domains and Indicators to be used to Measure Outcomes* ([document](#) attached). The document provides a list of measures to be used to gauge the performance of public and private agencies providing services to Washington children and families for the implementation of SSHB 2106. It

provides measures for child safety, permanency and stability, and well-being.

The next step for the Outcomes Advisory Committee is to develop two sets of performance outcomes for Phase II: (1) cases transferred and (2) new cases being assigned. The Outcome Advisory Committee will also work with CA, as well as the Legal and Practice Advisory Committee, to develop the process of care and quality of care measures to be used in Phase II. They will also work with the Site Selection and Transition Advisory Committee on developing evaluation criteria for Phase II.

Legal and Practice Advisory Committee Report

Judge Chris Wickham and Steve Hassett explained that the Legal and Practice Advisory Committee's first task was to create a list of core services that should be available and accessible to all children and families in the child welfare system. They explained that the list is not intended to be a list of services that every child and family would necessarily receive, but rather a menu of services available. The Legal/Practice Committee created three documents as a part of the process: [Principles and Values used to Determine Core Services](#), [Preliminary Service Array/List of Core Services](#), and [Preliminary Service Array Definitions](#) (all attached). Chris and Steve explained that the Legal/Practice Committee created these with the belief that state agencies and contracted service providers should, in addition to providing legally mandated child welfare services, strive to form a coordinated, comprehensive, and collaborative system to address any and all barriers to the safety, permanency and well-being of children and families. The Advisory Committee also wanted CWTDC members to know that they created a list of what they felt should be available to children and families and tried not to restrict it to just what is currently funded.

The CWTDC voted to accept the *Preliminary Service Array/List of Core Services* as a draft with twelve refinements suggested during discussion. The Legal/Practice Advisory Committee will take these recommendations into consideration and refine the document for a final vote at the June meeting.

Next steps for the Legal/Practice Advisory Committee also include determining who will provide what services (state and contractor) for Phase II, review and recommend definitions for and a process for recommending programs associated with Evidence Based and Promising Practice for Phase II, determine how legal representation will work in Phase II, how and when cases will be transferred from CA to contracting agencies in Phase II, as well as continuing to identify additional issues that need addressed.

Site Selection and Transition Issues Advisory Committee Report

Nancy Sutton and Jeanine Livingston presented the work of the Advisory Committee on Site Selection and Transition Issues ([presentation](#) attached). Jeanine first discussed how the Advisory Committee arrived at a determination for the size of the demonstration sites. She explained that the committee worked

with WSIPP to determine the annual caseload size needed to detect a 10% change in a few key outcomes (namely reunification for out-of-home care, as an example). That would mean approximately 14.25% of annual caseloads in the “treatment” group and 14.25% of annual caseloads in the comparison group in a randomized assignment. Next, she outlined the [criteria](#) developed by the Advisory Committee to use in determining preliminary demonstration site locations (attached).

The CWTDC voted to adopt the draft criteria developed by the Advisory Committee with four refinements suggested during discussion. The Advisory Committee will take the recommendations into consideration and refine the list of criteria for a final vote at the June CWTDC meeting.

Next, Jeanine and Nancy presented four different demonstration site preliminary scenarios: two for the west side of the state and two for the east side of the state. They explained that the sites were based on using the criteria established, as well as demographic information on each of the proposed sites ([demographic information](#) attached). As they continued to describe the sites, they explained to the CWTDC that they would not be asking for a vote. Rather, they hoped to garner CWTDC, community, and public input as the Advisory Committee moved forward. Jeanine advised the CWTDC that input should be directed to the Advisory Committee either through a form on the joinhandsforchildren.org website, or by attending the next set of Advisory Committee meetings (currently scheduled for April 15 and May 13). Jeanine and Nancy told the CWTDC that the Advisory Committee’s goal is to present solidified site recommendations at the June CWTDC meeting.

Finance Advisory Committee Report

Carole Holland and Sharon Osborne [presented](#) the progress of the Advisory Committee on Financial Issues. Sharon explained that the committee has done a substantial amount of work to compile information on cost modeling and projections, as well as where money is currently being spent by DSHS CA. Carol said that the committee is still working on a number of issues: unit costs, start-up costs, quality assurance resources, and capacities. At the next Advisory Committee meeting, the committee is going to take a look at how FamLink works and how agencies will be able to interface with this system.

The Advisory Committee on Financial Issues did not have any recommendations requiring a vote.

Discussion of Questions/Issues to be included in March 2010 Quarterly Report

The CWTDC requested that the co-chairs ask for clarification on the following:

1. Whether the legislatively mandated criterion, “neither site must be wholly located in any of the department’s administrative regions,” is permissive or restrictive? The Site Selection and Transition Advisory Committee would like to know if a demonstration site can be wholly contained within one

Children's Administration region or whether it needs to include at least two regions.

2. What content needs to be included in the June Phase II plan outlined in SHB 2106, as well as when the plan needs to be completed. The CWTDC are recommending that the plan be delivered with the third quarter CWTDC report the end of June/beginning of July after the currently scheduled June 14-15 CWTDC meeting. The co-chairs are also recommending that the following elements be included:
 - a. Values/principles to be incorporated
 - b. Performance-based contracting model
 - c. Type of contract, including detail on RFP process
 - d. Possible payment model
 - e. Outcomes to be measured
 - f. Service array with what state and/or contractor will be providing
 - g. Identification of two demonstration sites
 - h. Detailed timeline