

DEMONSTRATION SITE SELECTION AND TRANSITION ISSUES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE CHILD WELFARE TRANSFORMATION DESIGN COMMITTEE

MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 5, 2009 MEETING

Advisory Committee Members Present: Jeanine Livingston, co-chair; Nancy Sutton, co-chair; Mark Courtney; Brenda Lopez; Charlotte McCullough (by phone); Trudy Marcellay for Jerry Meininck

Staff Present: Julie Dunnington, Partners for Our Children (POC); Jennifer Strus, Senate Human Services and Corrections Committee

Others Present: John Howell, facilitator; Roxanne Lieb, Washington Institute for Public Policy; Sara Lee, POC

John Howell began the meeting by going through the Advisory Committee Ground Rules.

The next three meeting dates for the advisory committee were confirmed: 10/14 - 1 to 5 (probably a conference call); 10/29 & 11/12 - 1 to 5 Doubletree Hotel (subject to change).

There was a discussion about Children's Administration's (CA) revamp of the date by when they need the demonstration site recommendation from the advisory committee. The amended timeline that Julie saw pushed the date out from December 2009 to June 2009. The timeline will be shared and discussed at the next meeting of the advisory committee.

Julie indicated that Dana Phelps, the CA lead for the site selection, would try to be a guest at the advisory committee meetings. Jann Hoppler is the CA lead for performance based contracts and outcomes. The advisory committee determined that it would be helpful if Dana and Jann both could be regular visitors at the advisory committee meetings. Nancy will invite both Dana and Jann to be regular visitors.

The membership on the advisory committee was discussed. There have been suggestions to add a foster child (former), a foster parent and a social worker. Jeanine had a suggestion for a foster child; he is committed and articulate and his name is John Seals. The group agreed to invite John as a member of the advisory committee.

Next, the discussion turned to the addition of a foster parent to the group. Julie indicated that she had sent notice to a number of foster parent groups around the state asking if there were foster parents willing to serve on the advisory committee. FPAWS has responded and has provided Julie with three names and is working on obtaining more names. The original deadline for FPAWS to respond was 10/9; that deadline was extended to 10/13. Julie indicated that she also talked to Catherine Lanham, the foster parent representative on the Child Welfare Transformation Design Committee (TDC)

about getting the word out to foster parents she knows. Nancy suggested that Julie contact Dina Martin in CA headquarters to get the word out to the CA Foster Parent Advisory Committee as well. Foster parents who are interested need to fill out a bio sheet and Julie will bring those to the next advisory committee meeting so that members can review them and select a foster parent representative.

The advisory committee also discussed the inclusion of a social worker as a member of the advisory committee. Jeanine mentioned 2 social workers that she had spoken to who were interested. Nancy mentioned two other social workers that she thought would be good as well. Mark suggested that it might be wise to add two social workers to the advisory committee, one from the east side of the mountains and one from the west. The advisory committee agreed that there should be two social workers on the advisory committee, one from the east and one from the west. Charlotte suggested there be a private agency representative added as well. She suggested we select an agency that is fairly sophisticated with some case management experience and is not currently represented on the TDC. Nancy suggested an agency from Region 3 because that region is not well represented on the TDC, preferably a child placing agency that does general foster care and BRS. A larger agency is needed out of the I-5 corridor and with a larger infrastructure that would make the agency competitive on a statewide scale. Nancy will run these criteria past the RAs and see what their recommendations might be.

Charlotte suggested that the advisory committee also have someone from the legal community as a member. Nancy discussed the Assistant Attorney General representation or assistance for the advisory committee. Steve Hassett has indicated that an AAG from his shop would be at every meeting to provide legal assistance. The advisory committee decided to ask Tim Jaasko-Fisher to be a member and Carrie Hoon from the AG's office to be a regular visitor. Julie will contact Tim to find out if he would be willing to be a member of the advisory committee.

The discussion reverted to the social worker representation again. The advisory committee decided to invite Tommy Williams from Region 1 and Joe Mienko, Pierce West, to be members of the advisory committee.

Mark discussed the evolution of the language in 2SHB 2106 regarding site selection and outcomes. He discussed the importance of having a sufficiently large number of cases so that statistically significant numbers can be obtained for purposes of measuring outcomes.

Trudy Marcellay discussed the ongoing concern that the Tribes have with 2SHB 2106. The Indian Policy Advisory Committee has been trying to get information on the bill and the TDC's work out to the Tribes. There may be a request to the Governor that Tribal children not be included in the cases transferred in the demonstration sites. The Tribes are used to a government to government relationship and they do not have this relationship with private agencies. There may be Tribes involved in this process because there are Tribes in all six regions, but some are against the process outlined in 2SHB 2106.

The advisory committee reviewed some data from January 2009 on children in out of home care provided by POC. It was decided that the data needed to be broken down by DCFS office rather than just by region. There was a discussion about the information in Famlink and when it would be reliable enough to use. Nancy indicated that the regions are currently conducting hand counts until FamLink information is reliable.

In determining the demonstration sites there are two types of information the advisory committee will need: cases that are currently in the system and the flow of cases in and out of the system.

Roxanne Lieb indicated that WSIPP is convening an internal group to go about conducting the evaluations they need to conduct under the bill.

Data reports to consider for the next meeting:

1. Information on placement data on a child's first 60 days in care;
2. Information on child's placement after 60 days in care.

The data presented by POC which shows out of home placement data after the first 60 days in care should be run for the first 60 days in care by all of the categories listed. This data will give the committee an idea of the flow of cases in each office. The data should show the cases by ethnicity as well. Also need to see the number of children transferred to Tribal jurisdiction.

Staff will determine if Charlotte has any information about other states working with Tribes when doing what Washington is doing under 2SHB 2106.

It is important to have information on the state contracting process available for the next meeting.