

JOIN HANDS FOR CHILDREN
MINUTES FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SITE SELECTION AND TRANSITION ISSUES
April 15, 2010

Members Present: Jeanine Livingston; Nancy Sutton; Mary-Jeanne Smith; Joe Mienko; and Gwen Gua (for Trudy Marcellay)

Staff Present: Julie Dunnington, Matt Orme, Melissa Takade, and Benjamin Berres, Partners for Our Children; and Jann Hoppler, DSHS Children's Administration (on phone)

Others: Stephanie Lee and Marna Miller, Washington State Institute of Public Policy (WSIPP); Jane Zerbe, DSHS/Research Data and Analysis (RDA) (on phone); Carrie Hoon, Attorney General's Office (on phone); Krista Goldstine-Cole, Senate Democratic Caucus, Human Services and Corrections Committee; Lynnette Jordan, United Indians of All Tribes; and Mike Laederich and Kim Zacher, Comprehensive Mental Health

Jeanine Livingston and Nancy Sutton, co-chairs for the Advisory Committee on Site Selection and Transition issues, welcomed committee members and members of the public. Advisory committee members and the public introduced themselves before the advisory committee addressed the first agenda item, an update and review of the events and suggestions from the Child Welfare Transformation Design Committee (CWTDC) quarterly meeting in March.

During that March quarterly meeting, the CWTDC formulated a list of questions that were to be directed to the Washington State Legislature. Julie Dunnington received answers to some of these questions and reviewed them with the advisory committee. One of the CWTDC's questions directed to the legislature was whether demonstration site regions must straddle two regional services areas, or whether it would be allowed for a demonstration site to fall wholly within a single DSHS CA Administrative Region. Julie Dunnington explained that the legislature would accept proposals for demonstration sites that fall within a single region, because the introduction of random assignment evaluation methodology is capable of controlling for regional variations. Julie Dunnington also said that there would be a meeting with the Children's Legislative Oversight Committee, but the date had not been set.

The advisory committee then reviewed the CWTDC's recommendations for the site selection criteria and the initial demonstration site proposals. The advisory committee talked first about whether the proposed sites would be attractive to potential bidders. They also talked about county lines as potential building blocks for crafting demonstration sites. The advisory committee felt that each site must encompass both rural and urban regions.

Jann Hoppler suggested looking at incorporating county lines as a criterion because problems may arise when only small portions of counties are taken up in a demonstration site. The advisory committee decided to consider this question during the next meeting with the Research and Data Analysis Division (RDA) of DSHS. The advisory committee would also determine how zip codes fold into the county line issue. There was also a discussion on how cases are counted, and whether it would be worthwhile to count cases by families. The advisory committee felt that it would be important to gather information on families because it will be important to fully describe the characteristics of each proposed demonstration site. There were some concerns that there are not accurate data on the number of family units. The advisory committee felt that they need more data from FamLink, specifically on Family Voluntary Services. Jann Hoppler agreed to

facilitate a conference call with the data experts of DSHS Children's Administration to examine data availability from FamLink.

Carrie Hoon of the Attorney General's Office presented some information on the variability of AGO services from one county to another. In some counties, the AGO contracts for legal services. The committee determined that this would be a good secondary filter as they construct sites.

The advisory committee took a brief break.

When the advisory committee returned, they reviewed community input and suggestions on the site selection criteria submitted via the website. The committee reviewed approximately 15 comments, but hoped that the community would submit even more suggestions in the future. The input ranged widely in scope.

The advisory committee opened up the floor for public comment.

Krista Goldstine-Cole of the Senate Democratic Caucus wanted to bring attention to the criterion regarding the issue of racial disproportionality. She felt that the language did not adequately describe what the advisory committee was attempting to convey. The advisory committee responded to the question by offering a narrative outline on the origins of the criterion, but agreed to rework the language. The committee wanted to make sure that the children included in each of the demonstration sites were representative of the population of children being served in the regions where each of the demonstration sites are housed. She also asked a clarifying question on how the demonstration sites were sized. She suggested that in the criteria document, the primary drivers that are listed first should be those that are derived from statute.

The advisory committee then reviewed the updated demonstration site proposal maps. The maps are entitled *Preferred Demonstration Sites for Second Substitute House Bill 2106*. There were four maps distributed for discussion. Nancy Sutton asked about the next steps for the upcoming RDA mapping session. The advisory committee asked Jane Zerbe to review the maps and incorporate recent changes to the criteria, particularly the change that now allows demonstration sites to be wholly located in a single DSHS CA Administration Region. Nancy Sutton requested if RDA could attempt to make these changes and the advisory committee could make refinements during the mapping session.

The committee spent some time scheduling an RDA mapping session before the next meeting. No date was officially set.