

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

October 18, 2011
1:00 pm – 4:00pm

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 deHaan; Brenda Kaufman

Staff Present: Benjamin Berres, Partners for Our Children; Tammy Cordova and David Marshall, DSHS Children's Administration; Karen Dinan, Attorney General's Office; Jennifer Strus, Washington State Senate

Others: Marna Miller and Stephanie Lee, Washington State Institute of Public Policy (WSIPP); Chanel Carlin, United Methodist Youthville; Kristin Hall; Daryl Toulou, DSHS Office of Indian Policy.

Nancy Sutton, Children's Administration Regional Administrator for Region 3 and Site Selection Advisory Committee co-chair, welcomed the attendees and called for introductions.

Nancy Sutton requested that the Advisory Committee review the group's recent work and progress. Ben Berres passed out the Advisory Committee's demonstration site proposals they presented to the full TDC on October 7, 2011. John Lawson asked if the TDC held a vote on the maps. Jeanine Livingston said that the vote would be held at the next TDC meeting (Scheduled for November 8th, 2011) so that representatives could get input their respective constituencies. She also announced that there is a spot on the Join Hands for Children website where individuals can submit their comments.

Nancy Sutton reviewed her notes from the TDC meeting and the input on the maps:

1. The TDC asked if the Advisory Committee had considered service availability when constructing the demonstration sites.
2. There was some conflation between aspects of Part I and Part II of 2SHB 2106.

Jeanine Livingston asked if any of the Advisory Committee members had received feedback on the maps presented at the TDC. John Lawson was asked: If Seattle and Spokane are picked, is that an accurate representation of the state considering how service-rich each area is relative to other regions of the state. Nancy Sutton felt that this question is fair and legitimate. Trudy Marcellay added that the Tribes had the same concerns. Nancy Sutton commented that if these areas are not chosen, the demonstration sites easily become impractical in their geographic features or imbalanced in their demographic characteristics. Tammy Cordova said that she

received a question about whether the West A option was rural enough and why the option didn't drop one of the Seattle offices and add Skagit County. The committee considered this comment a little later during the meeting, but decided that they wanted input from someone from the African American community before making a decision.

The Advisory Committee attempted to reconfigure the sites based on the feedback, but ultimately felt that the original options they presented were the best possible given the circumstances.

Trudy Marcellay reported that the maps were presented at the last Indian Policy Advisory Committee (IPAC) meeting and that the Eastern Washington tribes voted unanimously for East Side A and all the Western Tribes voted unanimously for West Side A.

Nancy Sutton said that the Advisory Committee is still in need of further feedback.

Benjamin de Haan added that he had heard from one private service provider that the service array and delivery system in Spokane is not as sophisticated or developed as one might assume and that the TDC would be better off going with East B. His response is that the job of the Advisory Committee is not to attempt to control for all variables and that the service delivery system in Spokane is what it is.

Jeanine Livingston said that she hoped that the feedback could be categorized and synthesized.

Tammy Cordova said that Liz Mueller asked why the Advisory Committee picked up Clarkston rather than Colville and Newport.

Many Advisory Committee members resonated that people are saying "not in my backyard."

Before the Advisory Committee shifted topics, Jeanine Livingston opened up the floor for public comment. Channel Carlin of United Methodist – Youthville responded to the comments that would fall under the category of "not in my back yard." What she asserted is that in Snohomish County, she had been hearing "quite the opposite." She said that there are providers in that region who are very interested.

The Advisory Committee took a brief break.

The Advisory Committee shifted the focus of the discussion to the first draft of the list of transition issues relevant to Part II of 2SHB 2106. The list, as explained, is a compilation of concerns—some recent, some older—synthesized from the comments of previous committee meetings.

When the Advisory Committee reconvened after the break, they began to examine the list of transition issues relevant to the implementation of Part II of 2106. Benjamin Berres explained the sources of issues outline in the transition issues list passed out at the morning's meeting. Jeanine Livingston commented that the list is a living document and other issues may arise. She recommended that the list be categorized.

Some of the issues discussed include:

- *Case Transfer*

- *Random Assignment* – There was a discussion about how the numbers of children that are assigned using random assignment methodology might be hugely different as a result of the differences in family sizes. John Lawson was concerned that the workload for the public and private social workers might not stay equal when using a random assignment methodology. Jeanine Livingston thought that a monitoring process should be implemented to make sure workloads between the treatment and control conditions are properly balanced.

Benjamin de Haan asked about what happens in the instance when an extreme outlier enters the system. He cited an example from his previous work history when he was involved in a single case where a very large number of children were removed. Researchers would keep an eye out for extreme situations.

Tammy Cordova said that CATS is poised to begin work on FamLink to enable the system to assign cases randomly. Nancy Sutton thought it would be appropriate to begin meeting with them, or maybe for WSIPP to have a pre-meeting with them.

- *Trumping Decisions* – The Advisory Committee discussed the various case characteristics of legacy cases that might lead to their preclusion from participating in the test.
- *Opting-Out* – Jeanine Livingston identified a number of situations when she thinks it might be likely when someone might want to exert influence to which condition a case is assigned. The committee discussed a number of potential circumstances relevant to this issue.

The Site Selection co-chairs hoped that the Advisory Committee on Financial Issues would meet prior to the next TDC meeting.

As the discussion progressed, the Advisory Committee began to categorize new questions into broader issues. These categories will be applied to the first version of the transition issues document and then used for later discussion.

The Advisory Committee talked briefly about the experiences of Missouri and their current randomized study.

The Advisory Committee scheduled a further meeting for Oct 31, 2011 from 9:00 am to 11:30 and then adjourned for the day.