



FINAL

DHS Children, Adults and Families
Child Welfare Advisory Committee
March 12, 2008

Members

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dana Ainam | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leslie Currin | <input type="checkbox"/> Jean Lasater | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pam Patton | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Christine Stetzer |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Janet Arenz | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Don Darland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Robyn Cole for
Phil Lemman | <input type="checkbox"/> Doug Poppen | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judy Stiegler |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mike Balter | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kris Skaro for
Sara Gelser | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Benjamin
Hazelton | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lisa Kay for
Angela Sherbo | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ruth Taylor |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Iris Bell | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cathy Kaufmann | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jerry Moore | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Becky Smith | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nan Waller by
phone |

DHS Staff

- | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryan Johnston | <input type="checkbox"/> Jim Neely | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Toni Peterson | <input type="checkbox"/> Greg Parker |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mickey Serice | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nancy Keeling | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Madeline Olson | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Debbi Kraus-Dorn |

Guests: Bruce Goldberg MD, Kamala Shugar – AAG, Kathy Ledesma,
Brent Spencer – Umatilla Tribes

Minutes Recorded By Pam Pearson

OVERVIEW OF AGENDA, APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Stiegler: Welcomed the newest CWAC member: Christine Stolebarger. Reviewed today’s agenda. Other community partners have been invited to join by conference call at 9:30 for the Child and Family Services Review Program Improvement Plan (CSFR-PIP) discussion. Distributed the PIP timeline.

ACTION: The minutes of the 1/9/08 CWAC meeting were approved.

The minutes of the 10/10/07 Future Issues Work Group (FIWG) and 1/9/08 Teen Issues in Child Welfare Subcommittee were distributed. Questions about those minutes should be directed to Pam Patton for the teen issues subcommittee and any of the members for the FIWG.

INFORMATION SHARING

- Stiegler: The information provided in the meeting packets is for continuous reporting back to CWAC from CAF to keep the committee up-to-date on those items. Asked if there were questions.
- Serice: Regarding disproportionality of children of color, there have been a number of web trainings and articles as a national conversation is taking place. Oregon wants to be part of that conversation. DHS is already doing similar

work as mentioned in the articles around core values and diversity, including creating diversity committees and establishing certain hiring practices. We are moving to the next level and are working on a grant with the Oregon Commission on Children and Families around disproportionality.

- Arenz: How do you use the terms “culturally specific” and “culturally sensitive”?
- Serice: We use them interchangeably. As we move forward we may become more specific and define them separately. Notes that all areas of DHS are attentive to where the national trend is going.
- Bell: “Disproportionate minority contact” is a term used in juvenile justice. We need to look at the how decisions are made along the continuum of care and how they affect disproportionality, not simply provide another training on cultural competency.
- Stiegler: Agrees with Iris that DHS needs to drill down to the day-to-day decisions and what influences those decisions.
- Waller: The Juvenile Court Improvement Project is sponsoring training on these decision points and how to reduce overrepresentation. CWAC will be invited and she will distribute the meeting notice. She is also attending a national work group meeting in March.
- Patton: Although we are a child welfare focused group, we should look at the issue more holistically and look at the contact points with the parents to determine the needs of the parents so they can break the cycles of additions, etc.
- Waller: Agrees with Pam. There is a coalition including child welfare, police and mental health and others looking at the issue holistically.
- Stiegler: One reason we bring these issues back to CWAC is to have this circular process that is more than an exercise in disseminating information. At the last FIWG we talked about how to formalize the feedback loop. Would like input from CWAC on how to do better with the feedback.
- Stolebarger: Judges are now asking caseworkers how many face-to-face contacts and visits with parents have occurred. Caseworkers are not always able to provide the information.
- Waller: Court forms now prompt judges to ask those questions (SB 414). Caseworkers are trying to get the information, but it is not easily accessible.
- Balter: We have a large bucket on overrepresentation. We need to separate out training issues, policy issues and decision points in a matrix so we can determine what to analyze and examine.
- Waller: In Multnomah County, progress was made on the delinquency side, but lost with budget cuts. Need to know who comes in the delinquency door and

we do know that some children do come there from the dependency side. There is some good information on the delinquency side that can be used on the dependency side.

- Kay: DHS presented information on overrepresentation at a recent Multnomah County dependency meeting. The information was alarming and disturbing, but also motivating.
- Cole: At a recent Juvenile Crime Prevention Advisory Committee meeting, the Department of Corrections gave a presentation on children of incarcerated parents, including an example in which Clackamas County provides prevention services to children of recently released parents. These children are targeted as high risk and identified as a group to receive prevention services.
- Bell: Rep. Chip Shields has helped get more attorneys to do pro bono work to help parents get their children back.
- Patton: Because agencies fund and provide services in silos, there may be more that they are doing but we don't know how much or how well.
- Keeling: DHS has been working with incarcerated parents for some time. There is a parent training curriculum in which they practice what they learn during their visits with their children and have interaction with them before the parents are released.
- Stolebarger: Participated in the incarcerated parents program and it made a big difference for her. Having a parole officer from the family services unit also helped. It is important that parents receive treatment while in prison.

ACTION: FIWG will look at the overrepresentation issue during their next meeting and how CWAC can be more proactive and how to partner with these initiatives so we are doing more than reporting information.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES REVIEW PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLAN (CFSR-PIP)

At this time, Mr. Brent Spencer of the Umatilla Tribe joined the meeting by telephone.

- Stiegler: The FIWG determined that DHS should develop its policy option packages (POPs) so that they move the agency toward its goals. POPs also need to play against other things such as the CFSR-PIP. Today we have an

urgent timeline and need to decide how, based on that timeline, CWAC can contribute to the PIP.

- Ledesma: This PIP is quite different than the last one. The draft must be completed by April 7. We have some leeway in how clean it must be and the final PIP may, in fact, be quite different from the draft. Two states are ahead of us and a year after they submitted their draft, they still do not have a final PIP. Our draft PIP will show where we think we need to go and then we will work with the feds to finalize it.

In October 2007 we held a kickoff event. On January 8, we received a preliminary report from the feds. We have not received the final report yet. On February 4, 2008, we did a re-kickoff of the PIP. Community partners were invited to comment, but we did not receive sufficient community input. We are now at the last opportunity and want to filter community input through CWAC as the representative body. Community partners were invited to participate in today's meeting or submit comments in advance.

Provided a list of questions that CWAC may chose to use as a tool to comment on the PIP. These questions are in line with what the feds will be looking at.

- Johnston: The CFSR is a federal review of a state system based on federally defined criteria. There is an emerging trend of frustration and an awkward reality that while CWAC and others are concerned about fixing the whole system, DHS/CAF is concentrating on a federal requirement. There are currently 31 identified efforts to improve the system. We need CWAC to respond to the draft PIP so that we can respond to the feds. While it is important, we know it is not the whole cake. DHS wants to fix the child welfare system, but we have to do this too by April 7.
- Balter: At the end of last legislative session, Bruce Goldberg asked CWAC to focus on how to keep kids out of foster care and keep them safe. Are there certain outcomes that focus on these areas?
- Johnston: The feds chose the outcomes and we largely agree with them.
- Ledesma: We are trying to connect all the threads to show all the current activities so that we do not have to recreate. We are looking for broad strategies that address all categories in the CFSR. Referenced the document titled "Oregon Child Welfare 2008 Program Improvement Plan District Analysis and Suggested Broad Impact Improvement Strategies." District managers will submit their plans by March 21. Almost all want to continue the model court project.

Described the layout of the “Oregon Child Welfare Program Improvement Plan Working Draft.” The list of in-process initiatives is not complete. Would like CWAC to add any that are missing. Will add those mentioned during today’s discussion on overrepresentation.

- Bell: One of the strategies in the draft says DHS will use programs that are culturally appropriate and evidence based. There are very few such programs and you may be setting yourselves up for failure having that as a strategy.
- Ledesma: Explained that some domains have the strategies in priority order, others do not. If a strategy cannot be completed in two years, it will be part of the 5-year plan due June 2009, rather than in the PIP. We want CWAC to weigh-in on the strategies by March 21. CWAC’s input will be combined with input from the courts and the local district plans and sent out for another review. The PIP is due to the feds on April 7, 2008.
- Patton: DHS has a policy for gender specific services for children and youth. Recommends adding “gender responsive” to the strategy on being culturally responsive.
- Stiegler: Before we comment on specifics in the PIP, we need to decide on our process. We will not solicit reaction to the document until we have a process to do that coherently.
- Kaufmann: Because there is no way to tell if what DHS is proposing can be achieved in two years, should we look at whether the broad strategies make sense rather than getting into the specifics? We may need to narrow down how we respond. Some of the questions on Kathy’s list would be better answered when the plan is further down the road. We should look at whether the plan has a logical flow as a “plan to plan,” rather than deciding if the specific strategies are achievable.
- Stiegler: Because we have short timelines we will need a creative approach to be useful.
- Darland: Regarding Domain 6, does DHS want input from foster parents on the Who and How columns?
- Ledesma: Yes.
- Balter: That type of input is a different task than what is being asked of CWAC.
- Ledesma: Each CWAC member has a constituency. We want to make sure there is an opportunity for those voices to be heard. Because the workgroups have ended, we are looking for other ways to get input.
- Johnston: There are three types of responses. 1. Red-flagging specific things such as what we heard from Iris Bell and Pam Patton. 2. Questioning the broad

strategies and what can be done in two years, such as what Cathy Kaufmann said. 3. Comments from the CWAC members' constituencies and organizations. The collective consensus in #2 should be general enough so as to not compromise the committee's principles.

- Darland: It would be helpful to see the list of current initiatives.
- Waller: If Wraparound Oregon is not on the list of initiatives, it should be added.
- Ledesma: Will email the list to CWAC, adding those she heard about from CWAC today.
- Kay: One of Kathy's questions asks if the strategies address all the key concerns for the domain in which they are included. If that is not a requirement, who decides which key concerns will be addressed? Does not see a strategy addressing placement stability.
- Ledesma: Some strategies will have an indirect connection. We will have to articulate how all the strategies address the key concerns directly or indirectly. Placement stability may have an indirect strategy.
- Stiegler: If so, CWAC's answer would be to make the cross reference.
- Patton: Are we assuming training and funding will be available to implement the strategies?
- Johnston: You will need to include any assumptions needed to advance the actions.
- Arenz: How do you assure that DHS will accomplish the strategies?
- Johnston: Once we have committed to it, we are obligated and will be measured on it.
- Stiegler: Kathy's list of questions includes asking if the strategy identifies a need for additional resources and when they might be obtained.
- Kaufmann: Would like to see a matrix of the strategies and how they address the domains. We can then comment on whether or not they are sufficient.
- Johnston: Agrees, but wants CWAC to also answer the list of questions.
- Stiegler: Perhaps we should do something like we did to prioritize the policy option packages by first collecting individual input and then compiling it collectively.
- Balter: We should apply our principles to the strategies. We should identify which strategies we have confidence DHS could do effectively.
- Johnston: Also identify any missing strategies.
- Balter: There may not be time to do both unless we use the rest of today's meeting time to decide which ones are adequate.

- Kaufmann: First we need a matrix to see how the domains and strategies line up
- Darland: This will not be our only opportunity to drill down if Oregon follows other states in still working a year later to finalize their PIP.
- Spencer: Will be providing written comments from the Umatilla Tribe.
- Stiegler: Asked if we should use the rest of today's meeting or if there are other suggestions for how to do this. Time is of the essence and we need to be cognizant of what we can provide to the agency that is of quality.
- Johnston: Asked that what CWAC does today is not in lieu of the other things CWAC offered to respond to and provide.
- Balter: The task of linking strategies to the key concerns may have to be done in another meeting or virtually by email.
- Arenz: We need to agree to a statement about the timelines, process limitations, and a comparison of our vision for children with this exercise as a disclaimer to recognize the parameters and context of this assignment.
- Kaufmann: The task of answering Kathy's list of questions should be done after the initial PIP is completed and DHS is looking at measurable outcomes.
- Stiegler: But we also need a consensus statement on this draft plan.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to: Limit CWAC's analysis to the following, as individual members and as a committee. The process will include having Kathy Ledesma send CWAC a matrix of the domains, key concerns and strategies and scheduling a special CWAC meeting/conference call.

AS INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS:

- 1. Add to list of current initiatives.**
- 2. Give a critical eye to the draft plan and red flag any concerns.**
- 3. Provide input from constituencies on the "Who" and "How" columns in the draft plan.**

AS A COMMITTEE:

- 4. Prepare a consensus document commenting on**
 - A. How well the strategies address the domains and key issues.**
 - B. If they are the right strategies.**
 - C. If any strategies are missing.**

- Johnston: This is on the scale of what we want CWAC to do to get a statement from CWAC that says whether or not we have selected the right strategies.
- Stiegler: The red-flagging and input from members' constituencies are not part of the full committee consideration.

- ACTION:**
- **The above motion passed.**
 - **DHS will send the matrix to CWAC within the next two days. [Done 3/14/08].**
 - **CWAC will send individual responses to items #1-3 in the above motion to Pam Pearson by close of business, March 20, 2008.**
 - **A special CWAC meeting/conference call will be scheduled between March 21-28 to address #4 above. Other community partners will be invited to participate. [Scheduled for March 25, 1:45-3:45]**

DIRECTOR'S AND ASSISTANT DIRECTOR'S REPORT – Bruce Goldberg, M.D., and Bryan Johnston

Transformation / Child Welfare Staffing Update

- Goldberg: Our efforts to make ourselves the best human services agency in the world will take time, but we are on the road to getting there. The McKinsey work is the first step and will give us a sense of where we are, benchmarking against those who do it best. We will then set out a plan of how to get to where we want to be. It will take us 2-3 years to get there. The complete McKinsey report will be ready in May or June. Their Child Welfare Staffing Study looked at where we are at today in that area of the department. It is based on 1,200 interviews of child welfare staff, time and motion studies, office visits and stakeholder conversations. It looked at what we are supposed to be doing according to policy, legislation and federal rule and how we are staffed to achieve those things. The report shows we are understaffed by 25% if we were to do all we are supposed to do. It lists 17 ways to stop the negative workload cycles; only one of which is to add more caseworkers. It includes says working more effectively and stopping what we should not be doing can impact the negative workload cycle. Adding more caseworkers would account for about one-fourth of the gap. The ultimate outcome is to keep children safe. The staffing study does not tell how to put a plan together to improve the work to keep children safe. It talks about what we are supposed to be doing.

- Johnston: On the page titled “Current Gap Between Capacity Supply and Workload Demand...,” 100% equals current capacity. The graph shows how the workload gap increases as additional demands are added to current capacity.
- Arenz: What is the percentage of worker turnover? That is another factor leading to worker dissatisfaction.
- Serice: That information may be available in the full report available on the DHS website.
- Goldberg: When the plan for change comes from the people doing the work, they are empowered to make the change. Similar processes are used worldwide. People want to be accountable for what they do, so we need to give them the tools to be accountable.
- Patton: This baseline is good information. DHS is put in a double-bind when a request for more caseworkers takes away support staff. Infrastructures, systems and training are needed so the caseworkers have what they need.
- Goldberg: Another piece is that we do not do our work in isolation, but with community partners. We are gathering information on how to improve those relationships. We are starting internally to show we are willing to make those changes to be more effective, and then will spread it outward.
- Arenz: Why was the state of Washington chosen as the comparing state?
- Goldberg: Washington was chosen because the data was available, not because it was seen as the best.
- Moore: How does this information relate to the questions we have to answer on the PIP?
- Ledesma: This report was not available when the PIP Domain workgroups were active. This report provides more information to build into the PIP.
- Johnston: The page in the staffing study titled “In Recent Years, Negative Cycles...” illustrates the negative cycles that have worsened the gap between workload and staffing capacity. We are sharing this report as widely as possible, yet doing so can add to worker dissatisfaction. However, we are hearing that workers have faith in Bruce to move this forward. In everything we produce, we talk about a community response: bringing in other agencies, faith groups, etc, and how we can’t do it alone.
- Goldberg: We are looking at what we do well, what we are staffed to do, what outcomes we want and having the outcomes decide what we will continue to do. It is not just doing more of what we already do, but doing some things differently.

- Taylor: Concerned about the lack of parent involvement in all these initiatives. They are a key voice. A method of getting that voice heard is needed.
- Goldberg: Agreed with Ruth that we need to make that happen.
- Patton: Don't make the mistake of cutting services to an identified group of people. Gave the example of Level 7.
- Kaufmann: How big a tool will the staffing study be? Will the PIP and other efforts refer to it? Will another study be done to see what was achieved?
- Goldberg: We are changing from a caseload to workload staffing model. The current caseload staffing model is archaic in weighing all cases the same.
- Johnston: All is premised on our work remaining the same as when the study was done. If fewer children enter foster care, that helps us narrow the gap.
- Arenz: Cautioned against repeating a past danger in assuming cases involving younger children require more work, resulting in less for teens.

ACTION:

- **DHS to provide worker turnover percentage to CWAC.**
- **DHS to provide link to complete McKinsey Child Welfare Staffing Study.**
[\[http://www.dhs.state.or.us/tools/transformation/docs/cw_staffingstudy08.pdf\]](http://www.dhs.state.or.us/tools/transformation/docs/cw_staffingstudy08.pdf)

DHS Medication Management

- Serice: Draft report on psychotropic medications for foster children from the DHS medication management workgroup distributed to CWAC. It includes recommendations of the DHS workgroup and a workgroup from Multnomah County. As a department, we want to implement the recommendations. Some have a price tag; others do not. We have implemented some of the recommendations already. Some may require a policy option package. Getting ready to go to phase 2. A workgroup will be looking at informed consent.
- Stiegler: It refers to an advisory group. It is CWAC?
- Serice: No, the intent is a broader advisory group and CWAC is not specifically named.

ACTION: **The final report will be sent to CWAC when it is available.**

Policy Option Packages

- Serice: All POPs have been rolled into a department-wide list. Awaiting instructions from DHS Cabinet. Another version will be ready by the end of

March that will be sent to stakeholders. A road show is scheduled for late April and May. DHS Child Welfare has no legislative concepts at this time.

Ballot Measures

- Johnston: In the event a property crime initiative passes, it will impact women and children. The crimes being considered for inclusion in the initiatives fall more on women than some other crimes. If women are sentenced to prison and their children come into DHS Child Welfare custody, we have to move to permanency once they reach 15 months in our care. The initiatives impact statements do not include this impact. CWAC may want to talk about this at a later date.

ACTION: This issue will be added to the Future Issues Work Group's ongoing list of issues.

Meeting adjourned.