



FINAL

DHS Children, Adults and Families
Child Welfare Advisory Committee
Future Issues Work Group
February 6, 2008

Attending: Janet Arenz, Mike Balter (by phone), Benjamin Hazelton, Angela Sherbo (by phone), Mickey Serice, Becky Smith, Judy Stiegler, Judge Nan Waller (by phone)

Minutes Recorded by Pam Pearson

PRIORITIZATION OF DHS CHILD WELFARE-RELATED POLICY OPTION PACKAGES

Judy Stiegler recently became aware that CWAC has an opportunity to make a recommendation to DHS Cabinet on the child welfare-related POPs. The Family Services Review Commission recently submitted their recommendations for the POPs related to self sufficiency. The POPs are on the February 11 cabinet agenda. Because CWAC does not meet until March 12, the process to make a recommendation had to be accelerated. Using email as the communication tool, CWAC members were invited to rank the POPs as high priority, priority, no priority, or need more information. This FIWG meeting was called to use the rankings to prepare the content of a letter Judy will send to DHS Director Bruce Goldberg.

It was agreed CWAC would not submit a recommendation including every POP that at least one member ranked as high priority. The list needed to be pared down, either by consensus or some other method.

Mickey explained that a POP is meant to add something that does not currently exist or expand something that does exist. It does not necessarily require a legislative change. For example, adding FTE to enhance programs does not require a legislative change. The POP and legislative concept timelines generally follow each other initially, but the legislative concepts have a shorter timeline. Cabinet will be talking to the public about POPs in late spring/summer 2008. The POP list CWAC is working from lists only those related to child welfare. CAF also has self sufficiency and vocational rehabilitation programs. DHS Cabinet will pare down the department's POP list; however, at this time, there is no ceiling for how many will make the final list. The acronyms on the list for the office submitting the POP are:

- CW – CAF Office of Safety and Permanency for Children (aka child welfare)
- PPR – CAF Office of Program Performance and Reporting

- FSA – CAF Field Services
- CO – Central Office
- SNAC – Special Needs Adoption Committee

CWAC is not the only child welfare advisory body looking at POPs. The Child Safety Work Group may also make a recommendation. DHS is interested in what CWAC will be recommending. Mickey offered to ask Bruce Goldberg if he would accept CWAC’s recommendation after Feb. 11.

There was discussion about what guiding principles to use when prioritizing the POPs. The decision was to use CWAC’s “Principles for Child Welfare Change” as the overlay and illustrate which high priority POPS address the following key issues CWAC has been considering the past several months:

1. Preventing foster care placement;
2. Assuring that children placed in foster care are safe and are thriving ;
3. Providing permanency for children placed in foster care in a timely manner; and
4. Identifying strategies to reduce over-representation of children of color in the child welfare system.

The group acknowledged that some POPs may fit into others and may be dependent on others. However, those factors could not be considered due to the limited time the committee has to develop its recommendation.

While FIWG could not reach consensus, it was able to prepare the following tables. Table I lists the POPs considered high priority by the majority of CWAC members who participated in the ranking exercise. Table II lists the POPs considered high priority by at least 20 percent of the participants.

Table I—POPs receiving 60% or greater designation as “High Priority”

POP # and % designation as High Priority	Title	Key Issue(s)
JRP 1 70%	Prevention of Unnecessary Foster Care Placements – Family-Based Services	1. Prevention 4. Over-representation
JRP 2	Foster Care Prevention – Collaborative Problem Solving	1. Prevention 2. Safe/thrive

80%		4. Over-representation
CW 10	Enhanced Relative Search and Reconnecting Youth Services	1. Prevention 3. Permanency 4. Over-representation
80%		4. Over-representation
JRP 4	Reduce Disproportionate Number of Minority Children in Care.	4. Over-representation
60%		
JRP 6	Stability for Foster Children	2. Safe/thrive
70%		
JRP 10	Educational Advocacy for Juvenile Court-Involved Children	2. Safe/thrive
60%		
CW 12	Employment Related Day Care for Working Foster Parents	2. Safe/thrive
80%		

Table II—POPs receiving at least 20% but less than 60% designation as “High Priority”

POP # and % designation as High Priority	Title	Key Issue(s)
CW 5 20%	Restructuring of Family Based Services Contracts	1. Prevention
JRP 3 40%	Foster Care Diversion Pilot	1. Prevention
JRP 7 20%	Educational Success for Foster Children.	2. Safe/Thrive
CW 1 20%	Rate Increase for Providers	2. Safe/Thrive 3. Permanency
CW 13 40%	Respite Care Program for All Foster and Relative Caregiver Parents	2. Safe/Thrive
SNAC 22 20%	Special Need Adoption Coalition Rate Correction	3. Permanency
SNAC 23 30%	General Application Adoption Services to reduce out of state adoptive placements	3. Permanency
Oregon Alliance of	Provider Reimbursement to Cover	2. Safe/Thrive

Children's Programs 1 30%	Costs for the BRS Contracts	
----------------------------------	-----------------------------	--

The tables will be prefaced with an explanation of the process CWAC used in place of a face to face meeting of the committee, including that all members had an opportunity via email to provide input into the ranking process and FIWG was given the task for develop the final recommendations on behalf of CWAC.

The FIWG acknowledged that the process used to prioritize the POPs is not what they would prefer, but the best that could be done within the time constraints given.

Meeting adjourned.

ACTION: The following letter was sent to CWAC on 2/7/08 for review. Following CWAC's approval, it was signed by Judy Stiegler and sent to DHS Director Bruce Goldberg on 2/8/08.

February 8, 2008

Bruce Goldberg, M.D.
Director
Department of Human Services
500 Summer Street NE, E-15
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Bruce:

I recently became aware of a potential opportunity for the Child Welfare Advisory Committee (CWAC) to participate as a group in the prioritization of child welfare related Policy Option Packages (POPs) being presented to the DHS Cabinet. Being aware of a February 11, 2008, Cabinet meeting where these POPs will be presented and initially reviewed and vetted, I initiated a process wherein CWAC members had an opportunity to consider and prioritize these POPs. Unfortunately, because of the timing of the initial Cabinet meeting and the CWAC meeting calendar, it was not possible for the full committee to be able to meet face to face to come to a consensus on this prioritization. However, each member was given the opportunity to weigh-in via an e-

mail process, and participation in a special meeting of the Future Issues Work Group on February 6, 2008.

I can report that 10 of the 19 voting members of the CWAC participated in the prioritization process either via e-mail and/or in-person at the February 6 meeting. (Please note that this does not include the Chair who only votes in cases of a tie.) The CWAC conducted this prioritization in the context of our Principles for Child Welfare System Change, which was previously provided to you, and against four key issues the CWAC has been considering over the past several months. These issues are:

1. Preventing foster care placement;
2. Assuring that children placed in foster care are safe and are thriving ;
3. Providing permanency for children placed in foster care in a timely manner; and
4. Identifying strategies to reduce over-representation of children of color in the child welfare system.

We have divided those POPs receiving a ranking of “high priority” into two categories which are represented in the two tables set forth below. The first table represents those POPs receiving a 60% or greater designation of “high priority.” The second table represents those POPs receiving at least a 20% designation of “high priority” but less than 60% designation as such. Please note that the tables identify the POPs by proposing entity and number, a title, and the key issues represented. They also contain the percentage designation after each titled proposal.

Table I—POPs receiving 60% or greater designation as “High Priority”

POP # and % designation as High Priority	Title	Key Issue(s)
JRP 1 70%	Prevention of Unnecessary Foster Care Placements – Family-Based Services	1. Prevention 4. Over-representation
JRP 2 80%	Foster Care Prevention – Collaborative Problem Solving	1. Prevention 2. Safe/thrive 4. Over-representation
CW 10 80%	Enhanced Relative Search and Reconnecting Youth Services	1. Prevention 3. Permanency 4. Over-representation
JRP 4 60%	Reduce Disproportionate Number of Minority Children in Care.	4. Over-representation

JRP 6 70%	Stability for Foster Children	2. Safe/thrive
JRP 10 60%	Educational Advocacy for Juvenile Court-Involved Children	2. Safe/thrive
CW 12 80%	Employment Related Day Care for Working Foster Parents	2. Safe/thrive

Table II—POPs receiving at least 20% but less than 60% designation as “High Priority”

POP # and % designation as High Priority	Title	Key Issue(s)
CW 5 20%	Restructuring of Family Based Services Contracts	1. Prevention
JRP 3 40%	Foster Care Diversion Pilot	1. Prevention
JRP 7 20%	Educational Success for Foster Children.	2. Safe/Thrive
CW 1 20%	Rate Increase for Providers	2. Safe/Thrive 3. Permanency
CW 13 40%	Respite Care Program for All Foster and Relative Caregiver Parents	2. Safe/Thrive
SNAC 22 20%	Special Need Adoption Coalition Rate Correction	3. Permanency
SNAC 23 30%	General Application Adoption Services to reduce out of state adoptive placements	3. Permanency
Oregon Alliance of Children’s Programs 1 30%	Provider Reimbursement to Cover Costs for the BRS Contracts	2. Safe/Thrive

It is our hope and desire that this is just the beginning of the CWAC’s opportunities to assist and advise DHS on the prioritization of policies advancing the welfare of

Oregon's children. We are aware that this is only the beginning of the prioritization process and that some of these concepts will require legislative action in the 2009 session. Our goal is to be an active voice with DHS in this process.

I want to thank you in advance for your receipt of these recommendations and look forward to working with you further in this effort.

Sincerely,

Judy Stiegler
Chair, CWAC

cc: Bryan Johnston
Mickey Serice
Nancy Keeling
Jim Neely
CWAC members
Pam Pearson
