

**OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE CHILD WELFARE TRANSFORMATION DESIGN COMMITTEE**

MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 6, 2009 MEETING

Advisory Committee Members Present: Marian Harris, co-chair; Jeanine Livingston; Darcey Hancock; Mark Courtney; Maureen McGrath (by phone); Mary Meinig (by phone)

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

Others Present: John Howell, facilitator; Fred Wulczyn, Chapin Hall; Jann Hoppler, CA; Marna Miller, Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP); Stephanie Lee, WSIPP; Carrie Whitaker, Braam Panel staff.

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

Marian Harris addressed the issue of the number of advisory committee members. She indicated her and Ken Nichols desire to keep the number low because with a greater number of members the co-chairs would have to cajole people to attend and do the work. John mentioned that the Site Selection Advisory Committee, which had met the previous day, discussed adding several members to the Advisory Committee including a social worker, a foster youth and a foster parent. Marian indicated that she knew both a foster parent and several foster youth who might be interested. She agreed that the stakeholders of the work being done by the advisory committee should be represented on the advisory committee.

Julie explained to the committee the process set up to obtain the names of foster parents who might be interested in participating. She sent to FPAWS and other foster parent groups a bio sheet that the interested foster parents are to complete. Those are due to her by October 13th. Those names that are submitted will then be shared with the co-chairs of the advisory committees and, if the advisory committee decides it would like a foster parent member then it can select from the list provided by Julie.

Jeanine indicated that WFSE has pulled together a steering committee of social workers to assist Jeanine with the process set out by 2SHB 2106 and the Child Welfare Transformation Design Committee (CWTDC) . Jeanine would like to put forward the names of two social workers who would be interested in participating on the advisory committee. There were no objections to Jeanine's offer.

Julie discussed with the advisory committee the four other CWTDC members that expressed interest in being on the Outcomes and Transition advisory committee.

Marian requested that Dr. Tom Crofoot, a professor at Eastern Washington University, be permitted to join the advisory committee. She indicated that he is her alternate to the CWTDC and would bring a Native American voice to the committee.

Jeanine suggested Duane Thurman as the social worker representative to the advisory committee.

The group Passion to Action will assist POC in obtaining the names of interested foster youth. Julie will also follow up with the Children's Administration (CA) to determine if they also have names of interested foster youth.

There was a discussion about including a representative of the legal system on the advisory committee. The committee decided to wait and see if the need for this perspective arises as it goes about its work.

The advisory committee voted to include a representative of foster parents, foster youth and social workers as members of the advisory committee. The names to be submitted will be voted upon by the advisory committee via e mail before the next meeting.

John led the committee through the paper outlining the questions to be addressed in achieving the major focus of the advisory committee's work. Mark indicated that the question regarding how CA will substantially reduce its current number of contracts is an inappropriate question for this advisory committee. The appropriate issues/questions should be prioritized by the committee and because of the aggressive timeline produced by CA the committee needs to focus on the scope of the committee's work.

Some of the issues Mark thought are a priority are:

- What are the outcomes the system should be organized around?
- What data is needed?
- What are the capacity issues for both public and private agencies?

Mark suggested that the paper outlining the questions to be address should be restructured and sent out to committee members for input.

Fred Wulczyn stated that he wanted to hear questions from the committee member so that he can tailor what information he provides to what the advisory committee needs. He indicated that there are 3 phases to the exercise:

- What to look for - the mission critical purpose - safety, permanence, well-being;
- Where do we get the information to look at ourselves;
- How do we put this information together so that the picture we are looking at is distortion free.

Mark stated that the committee needs to come up with a finite number of measures to recommend. He discussed different outcomes used by different states. Well-being outcomes are hard to measure. AB 636 in California identifies processes rather than outcomes regarding well-being. Mark also suggested the committee look at the Chaffee Act - outcomes for adolescents - and see what they are.

The committee reviewed and discussed the performance measure handout.

It was decided that for the next meeting, more information on other state's outcomes should be provided. In addition, information on how the states define safety, permanency and whatever is meant by well-being. Staff will also rework the Focus Question sheet and e mail to members for their comments.

The performance measure handout will be sent out to committee members after an extra column is added for members to indicate whether the particular item is a process or an outcome.

The advisory committee took public comment.