

JOIN HANDS FOR CHILDREN
MINUTES FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SITE SELECTION AND TRANSITION ISSUES

September 27, 2011
9:30 am – 12:30pm

DSHS CA Region 3
Pierce West Office
3rd Floor, Room 348
1949 S. State Street
Tacoma, WA 98405

Members Present: Nancy Sutton; Jeanine Livingston; John Lawson; Trudy Marcellay; Benjamin de Haan

Staff Present: Benjamin Berres, Partners for Our Children; Tammy Cordova and David Marshall, DSHS Children’s Administration; Megan Palchak, Early Learning and Human Services (on phone); Karen Dinan and Carrie Wayno, Attorney General’s Office; Krista Goldstein-Cole, Senate Democratic Caucus (on phone)

Others: Marna Miller, Washington State Institute of Public Policy (WSIPP); Laurie Lippold and Lisa Owens, Children’s Home Society of Washington; Mary Stone Smith, Catholic Community Services; Linda Thomas; Mark Eddy, Partners for Our Children; Chanel Carlin, United Methodist Youthville;

Nancy Sutton, Children’s Administration Regional Administrator for Region 3 and Site Selection Advisory Committee co-chair, welcomed the attendees and called for introductions. Brenda Kauffman notified the Advisory Committee that she was ill and would be unable to participate.

Nancy Sutton requested that the Advisory Committee review the group’s recent work and progress.

Ben Berres summarized the work that occurred during the September 8, 2011 mapping session with Research and Data Analysis Section of the Department of Social and Health Services. He stated that the Advisory Committee reviewed previous maps and brought forward a few potential proposal sites for discussion. The co-chairs also developed some language that described the differences between the data sources. Mainly, the maps that were originally developed a year ago were based on CAMIS data and the new maps were developed using Children’s Administration data derived from the FamLink SACWIS system. They passed out a handout that contained this language. This document explains the positive attributes of the new data and describes why the numbers appear to have grown. The main point of this document is that the CAMIS data was pulled in an entry-cohort manner, whereas the FamLink data was pulled in a Point-In-Time manner. Benjamin deHaan asked if the legacy cases would be distributed in an equal manner across the experimental and control conditions. Jeanine Livingston mentioned that this question might best be added to the list of transition issues. Nancy Sutton said that the Advisory Committee felt that each case would be assessed for trajectory and those cases nearing permanency would be retained for fear that an added case manager transition would

lengthen time to permanency. Marna Miller of WSIPP said that unless there are larger changes than 10%, the evaluation would not be able to speak to some of the other outcomes aside from reunification.

Lisa Owens of Children's Home Society of Washington asked if there were going to be additional outcomes that would be considered in this evaluation outside of those included in the original performance-based contracting RFP. Nancy Sutton and Jeanine Livingston reiterated that the outcomes within the RFP were specifically included for performance measurement of Part I of 2106, not Part II.

Nancy Sutton reviewed the Advisory Committee's previous work to develop proposed demonstration sites. Tammy Cordova walked through a few data tables describing each of the proposed demonstration sites.

John Lawson asked about courtesy supervisions. The Advisory Committee talked at length about this issue and the possible permutations of case management scenarios that could be created in this transition. Nancy Sutton said that primary court jurisdiction would be granted the greatest weight. The Advisory Committee concluded that if children are placed into a demonstration site area, the process by which they would be given a courtesy supervision worker would employ a random selection process.

The Advisory Committee discussed the nuances and complexities of working with Tribes and how things work with tribal jurisdiction.

Once this discussion resolved, Tammy Cordova continued to orient the Advisory Committee to the data tables she provided. Benjamin de Haan asked whether it would be possible to identify within the length of stay, which children are in kinship settings. He suggested that this will be important down the road because some people might argue that these children are already home. Tammy Cordova commented that not everyone would agree with that assertion. Benjamin de Haan asked if all the columns in the data tables are necessary. He felt that the Length of Stay columns are not helpful for the selecting demonstration sites but are relevant for the evaluation. The group agreed that the Length of Stay data is not relevant for selecting demonstration sites.

The Advisory Committee took a brief break.

When the Advisory Committee reconvened, the group continued to discuss data.

Lastly, they began to look at the earlier demonstration site proposals. Nancy Sutton asked Marna Miller if each of the proposed demonstration sites would satisfy the n required to achieve statistical significance if the evaluation sought to see a 10 percent change in performance. The only issue she mentioned is around Toppenish, and if the Yakama Nation opted out of the evaluation, it would leave one of the demonstration sites too small.

Jeanine Livingston stated that her preference is East B and East C. John Lawson agreed. He said that both B and C have urban and rural communities, have a large enough population, and meet the geographic criteria.

On the west site, people expressed concern about choosing a demonstration that included Vancouver because its race/ethnicity breakouts don't accurately match areas anywhere else in

the state. Once again, meeting attendees agreed that West B and West C are appropriate suggestions.

Benjamin de Haan suggested that the Advisory Committee recommend a preferred East and West site. The group agreed. For the purposes of the AGO, East B might make more sense.

Jeanine Livingston said that West A did not clear the threshold set forth in the selection criteria. Nancy Sutton expressed similar concerns about West D. John Lawson said that both West A and West D were low on the numbers. The group talked at length about the influence of the military bases possibly affecting the potential demonstration sites. Advisory Committee members were especially concerned about moving forward a demonstration site proposal that included Joint-Base Lewis-McChord (JBLM). Nancy Sutton and David Marshall agreed that military bases present complex challenges. The other bases in Bremerton and Everett are not nearly as large as JBLM. Overall, the group vetoed both West A and West D.

On West C, the group decided to drop White Center and include Smokey Point. With the revisions, the Advisory Committee felt that the proposed site met the threshold of the selection criteria.

On West B, the Advisory Committee decided to use Pierce South, Shelton and Long Beach as opposed to using Pierce West. There was some concern about choosing a demonstration site where there is an office in transition. Pierce South doesn't exist yet, but Nancy Sutton suspected that full implementation should take place over the course of a year. Tammy Cordova added that you lose a real city by going with Pierce South. Nancy Sutton mentioned that you would get Lakewood in the new West B. Another concern among the Advisory Committee was the number of tribes impacted by this proposed site. Benjamin de Haan said that he would "argue strenuously" to not include an office within a demonstration site in the midst of a transition that the Pierce East/West/South offices will experience in the next year. The group felt that this might best be an alternate. The revised site would include the following offices: Pierce South, Tumwater, Shelton, Aberdeen, South Bend and Long Beach.

The group talked a little about the presentation they will make at the October 7, 2011 CWTDC meeting. The group agreed to circulate the presentation within the advisory group before the full TDC meeting to solicit feedback. Jeanine wanted to use the original presentation as a template for the next presentation. Jeanine and Nancy requested comments back from the Advisory Committee by Tuesday.

They also decided to set another potential meeting time. The group settled on October 18, 2011 in the afternoon.

The co-chairs opened up the floor for public comment. Mary Stone Smith of Catholic Charities strongly supported the West C option.

The final preferred sites were: East C and West C (including Smokey Point and excluding West Seattle).

The meeting was adjourned.