



FINAL

DHS Children, Adults and Families Division

Child Welfare Advisory Committee

March 25, 2008

Attending: Mike Balter, Iris Bell by phone, Benjamin Hazelton, Cathy Kaufmann by phone, Nancy Keeling, Kathy Ledesma, Jim Neely, Mickey Serice, Angela Sherbo, Judy Stiegler

Minutes recorded by Pam Pearson

REVIEW OF AGENDA

- Stiegler: The 3/25/08 working draft PIP incorporates all comments received from Angela Sherbo, Benjamin Hazelton, AAG Kamala Shugar and federal Region X.
- Ledesma: Our deadlines are non-negotiable and we are doing several things at once within those timelines. This is not a draft PIP, but a working document. Having received comments from Region X at this point will help short circuit some of what we will have to do after April 7, when the draft PIP is due. The working draft language has not been changed since the 3/13/08 version CWAC received earlier. The comments appear as side notes in the margins next to the part of the draft they are addressing.
- Sherbo: The portion on values was not in the 3/13/08 version.
- Ledesma: We added that at Region X's request. See Region X's comment on page 4 (KL12). The values and principles were developed by the domain small work groups and should be considered draft. She also added some blank spaces at the end of each domain where the district PIP plans and local model court projects will be inserted. She has grids of the local plans and model court projects if CWAC members are interested.

DEVELOPMENT OF CWAC CONSENSUS DOCUMENT REGARDING CFSR-PIP

- Stiegler: During the March 12 CWAC meeting, we approved a motion to provide input both as individual members and as a committee. The individual input is completed. Today we are developing a consensus document 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.Suggested we work through each domain one at a time.

- Balter: How does CAF define “strategy”? How are they linked to the key concerns?
- Ledesma: Gave an example of a strategy in the first PIP that did not work. It was to rewrite policy and train to it. It was not specific enough. We are writing strategies with action steps over the eight quarters of the PIP. The strategies are more specific than in our first PIP and less specific than the action steps that will be written later.
- Balter: CWAC narrowed its advice to look at the issues to see if there was logic between the issues and strategies and to see if any strategies were missing.
- Stiegler: Also we want to clarify what part of the PIP the strategies refer to.
- Balter: Are they general strategies for a whole domain or linked to specific key issues?
- Ledesma: In some cases, there is no strategy for a key issue in the domain, but it is mentioned in another domain.
- Stiegler: Are the strategies linked to the goals more so than to the key issues?
- Hazelton: That is how he organized his comments.
- Sherbo: Is there a ballpark figure for how many strategies there should be?
- Ledesma: No, but we must do any that we put forward.
- Sherbo: That is why she limited herself to three or four for each, so as to not be too ambitious.
- Ledesma: The instructions to the workgroups were to prepare 2-3 strategies per domain to address the key concerns and to fit within the goals. In some cases, Region X found a goal was missing.
- Keeling: So a strategy is how to achieve the goals.

Domain 1 In-Home Safety

- Ledesma: Region X recommended Domain 1 be broadened to include safety both in-home and out-of-home. Strategies are needed to address Goal 1B (safety in foster care and other out of home placement settings).
- Sherbo: Suggested renaming the domain “Maintain Safety.”
- Ledesma: Timeliness of investigation is a missing strategy.
- Balter: Should timeliness be elevated to a goal instead of being a strategy, since it addresses safety in the home before there is an investigation? A goal is needed about children being quickly investigated.
- Ledesma: See page 7, Region X’s comment (KL17) that at least one strategy about timeliness must be included. Do the three goals in Domain 1 address what is in KL17? In her opinion, the answer is no.

- Balter: How soon should an investigation be done?
- Ledesma: Within the timelines in our policy.
- Balter: Four goals about safety are needed; one for each stage of where the child is in the system.
- Stiegler: Agrees putting timeliness as a goal is better than keeping it as a strategy.
- Ledesma: See page 4 for suggested language for a goal.
- Sherbo: That language is a strategy. The goal is to keep children safe, identifying all children not safe in their environments. Argues that timeliness is a strategy – to comply better with policy. Could add something to the current three goals such as: “Identify children that are unsafe in their placements and safely maintain...”
- Balter: If safety is the issue, where are the points of intervention? We are missing a point of intervention with these three goals.
- Ledesma: Is identifying children that are not safe an activity of DHS/CAF?
- Sherbo: Before you can safely maintain children in their homes, you have to know that they were not safe.
- Balter: It is the agency’s role to respond to reports from other sources.
- Stiegler: That is the timeliness piece. The issue is the make sure the initial investigation is done promptly and to maintain safety of the child.
- Hazelton: Suggested “Timely respond to reports of maltreatment throughout the life of a case” as its own goal to raise it to a higher level.
- Sherbo: The goal is to make children safe.
- Keeling: For timeliness to respond, the goal is to determine if abuse or neglect occurred.
- Balter: Suggested: “Create the capacity to identify and respond to children who are unsafe,” which is the agency’s role.
- Ledesma: What we send to the feds on April 7 will not be a perfect paper. We will have further opportunities to improve it. But we do need to have something about timeliness in the product we sent on that date.
- Stiegler: Regarding the issue of safety, the domain identifier is the broadest statement, a goal is more specific and a strategy is how to address it.
- Ledesma: When thinking of strategies at the local level, we need a specific strategy to assure timely investigations will happen such as working better with law enforcement.
- Sherbo: A goal should not be to meet timelines, but to identify children who are not safe so that they can be made safe.

ACTION: CWAC recommends the following goal be added to Domain 1: “Promptly (as identified in policy) respond to reports of children who are identified as unsafe in their own homes or substitute care.”

Discussion on how to proceed with other domains

- Balter: Suggested looking at the goals in each domain before moving to the strategies.
 - Sherbo: Did not work on the goals in her comments because she understood they were already written.
 - Stiegler: Our assignment was to look at the strategies.
 - Balter: So the assumption is that the goals have been properly made.
 - Hazelton: Except there are some goals missing in other domains, such as Domain 4.
 - Ledesma: Region X met with us and said these should be our goals.
 - Stiegler: Is the PIP too far down the road with the goals, or have the feds said there are other places where a goal is missing?
 - Sherbo: Suggested staying with Domain 1 strategies before going to the other domains.
- Stiegler: We were asked to comment on the strategies. Agreed to continue in Domain 1 keeping in mind the three questions:
- A. How well the strategies address the domains and key issues.
 - B. If they are the right strategies.
 - C. If any strategies are missing.

Strategy 1-A

- Ledesma: On page 7 we need to add a strategy for the goal we added.
- Bell: Repeated her concern from the 3/12/08 meeting about Strategy 1-A’s language “...culturally appropriate services that are evidence-based...” Very few such services exist because culturally appropriate services have not been identified as evidence-based and do not yet meet the evidence-based standards.
- Ledesma: Point well taken. If we have an overarching strategy in the PIP to respond to families of color and children of color in different and more focused ways, we could strike the culturally appropriate language from this strategy.
- Bell: Disagrees. We need the culturally appropriate services, but don’t identify them as evidence-based.

- Stiegler: The descriptor of “evidence-based” is ahead of the science.
- Bell: The science and rigor have not been normed for culturally appropriate services.
- Ledesma: Region X comment (KL19) also asked about evidence based.
- Sherbo: Suggested striking “that are evidence based and”. In KL19 is proposed language from Angela for Strategy 1-A: “Significantly reinvest in family-based services that are evidence-based and designed to enhance families’ capacity to care for their own children, including the Family Based Services (FBS) and individualized services funded with System of Care (SOC) flex funds.” It focuses on spending money to achieve results.
- Hazelton: Is not opposed to reinvesting, but prefers to leave as is so ~~that the obligation is to maintain the access~~ **it is clear that there is an obligation to improving access whether or not it is possible to reinvest.**
-
- Sherbo: Suggests striking the language that names specific documents in the Oregon Safety Model.
- Stiegler: Perhaps “culturally appropriate” needs to be later and the focus here needs to be to maintain children in their homes.
- Keeling: The services focus on keeping children safe and helping families care for their children.

ACTION: CWAC recommends the following language change for Strategy 1-A: Significantly reinvest in, and improve access to, services that are designed to enhance families’ protective capacity to care for their own children and are culturally appropriate, including Family Based Services (FBS) and individualized services funded with system of Care (SOC) flex funds and Supportive Remedial Day Care.

Strategy 1-B

- Sherbo: Suggests more general language and striking the language that names specific documents in the Oregon Safety Model. Referred to comment KL20.
- Hazelton: Clarified that what we propose will be a recommendation from CWAC. Does not want to presume we can rewrite what the workgroups did.
- Sherbo: I was on the Domain One Workgroup and it had met several times. The membership kept changing and what I thought we had agreed to in the early meetings that involved more community partners was changed at the last

meeting that was scheduled at a time I could not attend. When I rearranged my schedule to attend by phone I was given the wrong conference call number and so was able to attend only the very end of the meeting and I again raised my concerns and was doing so again at this meeting.

Discussion on how to create a consensus document

- Stiegler: CWAC was asked to create a consensus document. We must keep our focus on the three questions we narrowed our work to, otherwise we will not have anything by the end of today.
- Sherbo: A strategy to keep children home is a term or art and not broad enough to be a strategy.
- Sherbo: We recognized we could respond only in a limited way and narrowed our focus to the three questions in our motion.
- Ledesma: Brought this to CWAC because we had not received as broad community participation as we had hoped to get in the workgroups. The March 12 CWAC meeting was an opportunity to get additional voices heard.
- Balter: Maybe we can't accomplish what we were asked. His intellect leans to keeping the strategies broad. The challenge is that we have come into the middle of a process and he is struggling with the chaos of the documents.

Motion: Motion made, seconded and approved that we identify that CWAC was not able to come to consensus in the time allotted for the task. The comments from Angela Sherbo and Benjamin Hazelton stand as the best advice from CWAC members that could be provided in the time available.

- Stiegler: We are toward the end of a process that began in October. Without the benefit from going back to step one, we are not able to come to a consensus on this weighty and in-depth document.
- Sherbo: Could we come to a consensus on things to take out of the PIP?
- Stiegler: We do not have the context to do even that.
- Serice: What we send in on April 7 will be the first draft. There will be other opportunities after we get feedback from the feds. We may be able to continue today's process at that time.
- Stiegler: We need to be able to adapt to timelines not in our control, but realize that sometimes it works and sometimes it does not.

- Ledesma: That is the point exactly. Participation by CWAC has been low in the PIP development. There was opportunity for input all along the way.
- Stiegler: The opportunity was for input as individual members, not as a committee. Now it is difficult to get group consensus at this point in time. Agrees that individuals had enough opportunity to participate. We may need a dialogue on how better to get group participation in a task such as this.
- Balter: Hears that there was ample opportunity to participate, so why didn't more members do so? He did not feel he had been invited as a CWAC member, but rather as a representative of his organization. There is a pattern of coming to CWAC at the end of lengthy processes. We are being told we should have participated in October. We tried to see if we could do a more general approach, but have no common definition of the terms. We want to do our CWAC jobs, but it is very difficult. Need to do a better job of running things through CWAC.
- Stiegler: Should have defined CWAC's role in the PIP at the beginning. Individual members participate in many ways and for many reasons.
- Keeling: Realizes that when DHS sends individual letters to CWAC members we say we have invited CWAC, but that really is not the case.
- Balter: An individual member cannot speak for CWAC. He can speak only for himself and the organization he represents.
- Sherbo: Suggested adjourning the CWAC meeting and using the rest of our meeting time to give individual advice.
- Bell: Has some individual comments and will contact Kathy separately.
- Stiegler: We need to be more proactive earlier as a committee. Acting as a group requires something different than acting as individuals.
- Serice: It might be worth our time in the Future Issues Work Group to look at how DHS can engage CWAC as a whole.
- Keeling: We are thinking we have engaged CWAC when we send requests out to an email group that includes CWAC members, yet CWAC is saying, "Engage us!"

ACTION: Future Issues Work Group will look at how DHS can engage CWAC as a whole. It will be added to the CWAC list of issues.

Meeting adjourned.