



FINAL

DHS Children, Adults and Families
Child Welfare Advisory Committee
September 13, 2006

Members

- | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dana Ainam | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Don Darland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phil Lemman | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Angela Sherbo | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ruth Taylor |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Janet Arenz | <input type="checkbox"/> Sara Gelser | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nancy Miller | <input type="checkbox"/> Becky Smith | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nan Waller |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mike Balter | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Matthew
Tschabold for
Mickey Lansing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pam Patton | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Christine Stetzer | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leslie Currin | <input type="checkbox"/> Jean Lasater | <input type="checkbox"/> Doug Poppen | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judy Stiegler | |
-

DHS Staff

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ramona Foley | <input type="checkbox"/> Jim Neely | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Toni Peterson | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patricia Feeny |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mickey Serice | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nancy Keeling | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Madeline Olson | <input type="checkbox"/> Debbi Kraus-Dorn |

Guests: Diana Cohen-Alpert – Family Services Review Commission, Rosemary Lazzari – Family Services Review Commission, Kamala Shugar – AAG, Michelle Cole – *The Oregonian*, Christine Stolebarger

Minutes Recorded By Pam Pearson

INTRODUCTIONS, APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ruth Taylor introduced Christine Stolebarger, a parent whose children had been in foster care. Christine shared her experiences with the DHS and prison systems. She now mentors other parents involved in the DHS child welfare system.

The July 12, 2006, minutes were approved with the following change on page 11:

- Angela Sherbo will ~~prepare~~ lead the discussion on the practices document for the next Legislative Subcommittee meeting.

PRINCIPLES FOR CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM CHANGE

- Stiegler: Summarized the history behind the draft Principles presented for discussion today. Nancy Miller prepared another reiteration of the first draft based on discussion during the 7/12/06 CWAC meeting. The Future Issues Work Group met on 8/1/06 and produced another draft, which went to the Legislative Subcommittee on 9/5/06. The Legislative Subcommittee had been given the task of preparing a list of foster care practices that fall under these principles. They struggled with the task and consequently concluded this can be an end product by itself. Timothy Travis attended the Legislative Subcommittee in Nancy Miller's absence. He underscored that, as a system, we

have not had a statement to the outside world (especially the legislature) that says that when considering changes to the child welfare system, these are the basic principles to take into account. We open this draft document up to CWAC today for discussion and action. We will need to decide if we want something in addition for foster care specifically or if this is what we will send to Rep. Dalto. The Legislative Subcommittee discussed the idea of a shorter checklist as a companion piece to review proposals for change and decide if the proposals could be endorsed or not. Judy asked if others that attended the Legislative Subcommittee wanted to clarify anything.

- Miller: While she prepared the second draft that was sent to FIWG, she was thinking about it as a list of values that could be an overlay to every child welfare discussion we've ever had with the legislature and when analyzing legislative bills.
- Stiegler: The Legislative Subcommittee agreed it could be used as an overlay. The shorter checklist format could be used for that purpose, with this document as the template from which we play everything off. The Legislative Subcommittee also discussed how these principles could impact conversations on child welfare. It could start changing the way the conversations occur. We would have some bottom lines regarding change in child welfare. It could steer conversations in a certain direction.
- Balter: It could be used to frame CWAC conversations also. CWAC could find agreement quicker and find where we are having difficulty coming to agreement.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to adopt the draft Principles as a working document with the understanding that we will not know if it works until we use it. The motion was opened for discussion.

- Sherbo: This is close to being adoptable. The first three and last bullets are general and agreeable. The fourth and fifth bullets are too specific. The intent of 1-3 is about individualizing the response to children's needs. Saying that children at risk come in "all ages" is too specific. Saying that our system must meet the needs of all children "who are not safe" is too specific. Instead, we need to say that the system needs to have an individualized response to the needs of each child. There should be a principle about the importance of continuity of all relationships, not only the parental relationship. These two bullets need to be redrafted.

- Patton: The message behind the statement that children at risk come in all ages was that we don't vie for one group over another. It was not meant to be a message of an individualized response. We may need to add another bullet for individualized response. Recommended keeping the bullet about age.
- Stiegler: We may need to encompass all the varieties of children that child welfare comes in contact with and that none should be played off another.
- Sherbo: Examples would be age, race, and ethnicity. Recommended taking out any examples because the reader will focus on the examples listed, so we would have the difficult task of including a complete list.
- Foley: Is very much in favor of a list of principles. Pointed out that, other than Dana Ainam, there is no diversity represented in CWAC. We may need to include in the principles that there is over-representation of some races in the child welfare system. Asked if that was discussed when the principles were developed.
- Stiegler: FIWG discussed pitting populations against each other. The flip side of that is over-representation. The system needs to be responsive to all.
- Taylor: We need to involve recipients of services in the conversation.
- Miller: Perhaps that could be added to the last bullet. It would put the burden on the agency to involve parents in improving the system.
- Balter: Suggested adding it to the bullet on parental accountability.
- Waller: Caregiver participation comes at two levels: being part of the decision on the specific case and being part of policy setting discussions. She moved on to say that for any change we want, we must have reason to believe it will work. We don't want "policy by news release."
- Stiegler: Could that be part of the 2nd bullet?
- Balter: It would be added to the end of the 2nd bullet.
- Serice: Regarding the 5th bullet on the parental relationship. The intent was that the first expectation should be that parents are to keep their children safe. As a state, we tend to look first at agencies and then the parent. With this bullet, we recognize parental responsibility. Agrees with the earlier suggestion about adding something about continuity of relationships, but separate from this.
- Waller: The statute says the state will work to sustain and improve the relationship between parent and child. We could have something that says we need to attend to those other primary relationships (school, foster parent, grandparent, etc.). They are in addition to the parent relationship in and of itself.

- Sherbo: Is not comfortable with the parental responsibility language. It is too specific. It injects a different level of discussion into the document. We should instead recognize all family relationships.
- Balter: The issue is one of balance. We recognize the balance of role, responsibilities and supports of parents, family and other caregivers. The agency should not be taking charge. We need to find a place of balance and word it around that. That pushes it back up to the principle level.
- Patton: We need to recognize the importance of relationships and the need to support the balance.
- Foley: Our workers will also read this document. Accountability is a volatile word and could lead to blaming parents when things don't work well. This needs to say that it's a relationship that must be respected.
- Miller: We might be able to tie it in with the Oregon Child Welfare Safety Model. One of the things the model is based on is that the protective services system is invasive and workers need to recognize that.
- Waller: DHS' statutory role is to work toward safe reunification in a reasonable time. If all relationships are put on equal ground, that puts the parent/child and foster parent/child relationship on the same level. There are differences in those relationships and the agency's responsibility towards each is different. The agency does not have an obligation of recognizing the child's relationship with the foster parent to the same degree as it does the child's relationship with the parent.
- Balter: We do need to make the distinction of family relationships and then deal with the issue of the tension.
- Foley: The definition of who is "family" has evolved over time.
- Patton: Suggested inserting "...and continuity of relationships." to the end of the first sentence in the 5th bullet.
- Miller: We should not be afraid to use strong words such as parental accountability. Powerful words can be good.
- Stiegler: The system must support the parent/child relationship, yet hold parents accountable.
- Cohen-Alpert: Suggested adding the word "respect" to the 5th bullet so that the system recognizes and respects the parent relationship.
- Stiegler: Suggested having FIWG create another version based on the comments heard today.
- Darland: Children-of-color is a separate issue and needs to be apart from the bullet about age of the child.

- Stiegler: Ramona Foley had talked about how the issue of over-representation is a separate issue.
- Miller: Suggested bringing in the piece of cultural respect when talking about how services need to be responsive the children's race, culture, etc.
- Waller: Asked if the last bullet says that we want the larger picture to be considered when changes are made to the child welfare system, including the impact on mental health and other agencies. And likewise, we hope that when changes are proposed for other agencies, the impact on child welfare be taken into account. These impacts are not only fiscal, but also workload.
- Stiegler: The subcommittee did discuss that, but it may not have been captured here. We used "Justice in the Balance" as a model, which was a document used by public safety agencies last session. These principles can be used internally and externally.
- Balter: Don't lose the part about parental voice in decision-making.
- Foley: It will be very helpful to have a set of principles to hold things against.
- Patton: We need to add that adolescents need a voice in the decisions about them.
- Stiegler: Asked if the committee agreed to the idea of developing a checklist version as a companion piece.
- Waller: This document is only one page and to reduce it more will lose its meaning.
- Stiegler: For now we will use only the one document.

ACTION: The committee agreed that there is value in continuing to craft these principles. FIWG will prepare another version. Because CWAC does not meet until November 8, the next version will be considered final for an email vote. Today's discussion was the opportunity for comment. The voting process will not include opportunity for comment. If approved, it will be sent to Ramona Foley and Bruce Goldberg for final approval before going to the House Interim Committee on Child Welfare.

DHS DIRECTOR'S REPORT – BRUCE GOLDBERG, M.D.

- Goldberg: Regarding the DHS budget, the issue that concerns him is that there are competing needs around the state in human services. There is a sense that we are heading into a prosperous period in Oregon and we will have resources to take care of the needs. The reality is that over the past five years we have

failed to keep pace with payments to providers and families, we have cut services, and we have cut people from programs. There will be additional state revenue in the next biennium, but growing caseloads and cost of living increases will take a large piece of that additional revenue.

- Miller: Asked where the Governor stands on the need. A recent press release announced the Governor plans to fully fund Head Start. She mentioned that as an example of the push and pull across systems and programs.
- Goldberg: The Governor is prioritizing children, including that all will have access to health care.
- Miller: Asked about alcohol and drug treatment.
- Goldberg: The Governor is aware of the need to restore A&D treatment. It is clear that an impact on serving the most vulnerable children can be made by addressing untreated mental health and substance abuse. We can make more treatment available by putting more dollars in the system and prioritizing the dollars we have. Recognizes there are many competing needs and we need to spend the dollars the best way possible. We are looking at additional resources in mental health and A&D treatment in our budget. There are both economic and social reasons for this prioritizing. Regarding our policy option packages, he appreciated the feedback from CWAC. The policy option packages do not do everything needed, but they are a move forward. They address infrastructure needs (rates, dollars) and add some services back. They are packaged to send the message that we need to look from a system-wide perspective and move away from 20 different line items.
- Balter: Will be looking for ways to work with DHS so that requests are not competing. This is a resource-based problem. He has asked for information on how deep is the historical hole.
- Goldberg: That is the conversation he wants to have. We all share the same goals, but have different roles. We cannot be working at cross-purposes. There is a benefit in being clear about the message and the information. If something is not included in the DHS budget, it's not that it isn't important, but simply is the fiscal reality. There is a gap between services that are important and what DHS is able to provide. We need to be clear on what is needed to close that gap.
- Cohen-Alpert: In her work, she sees friction between county and state when the county must step in where the state does not fund. She wants to be an advocate for both Multnomah County and DHS and hopes to be given information to do so. Multnomah County will face cuts that will impact social service agencies.

- Goldberg: He has talked with Multnomah County about how to coordinate and how to advocate that services in Multnomah County best be used. He is doing some collaboration with child welfare issues and how state and county can share information and work together. An example is that when schools identify students that qualify for reduced lunches, DHS can sign them up for the Oregon Health Plan.
- Patton: One of the problems is that DHS is fragmented in its budget. We can be a partner with DHS when it does not have a budget that vies one program against another. The role we can play is that we can ask for more, unlike the agency that must support the Governor's budget. We need to make sure that what we ask for is what is needed to get where we need to go. That takes communication.
- Goldberg: Agrees.
- Stolebarger: She is the person that uses DHS services. In her case, her son receives free school lunches, but she does not qualify for OHP. Her son uses mental health services, but she does not qualify for them. She received her treatment while in prison. Bus passes are not available from DHS in Portland to help parents get to their treatment.
- Goldberg: We have to look at this from the perspective of what people and families need, not from a programmatic viewpoint. There are so many areas that have needs. We are prioritizing where to put these first resources. It is a shame when people have to go to the criminal justice system to get services. To get children healthy, the parents have to be healthy.
- Patton: Asked if there was something that could be done to provide bus passes for the rest of this biennium.
- Foley: We can ask that when the TANF staff come here later in the agenda.
- Sherbo: In order to create the partnership, the agency needs to give out the information. There is a natural reaction to not share information that makes one look bad. However, advocates can use that information.
- Goldberg: Has no disagreement with that. He is looking at creating an absolutely transparent agency. He does not pretend to be perfect, but the reality is that we cannot address every shortcoming at the same time. The conversation needs to be about where to start.
- Waller: Is pleased to hear that Bruce is open to creating new ways to do business with partners. There are creative ways to do things better notwithstanding the limited resources.
- Goldberg: There are two tracks: We need to do a better job of the things we must do and we need to advocate around structural issues such as funding.

- Miller: Referred to the document provided in the agenda packet on DHS child welfare reductions and add backs. Information in this format is difficult to read.
- Foley: She was reluctant to distribute it to CWAC because it does not encompass all the complexities of the entire agency. We need Jim Scherzinger to attend a future CWAC meeting for that.
- Goldberg: It happens that partners ask for information and don't get what they asked for. It could be in the way it was asked or how the request was heard. We have a complex agency and when we are asked questions, we don't always give an easy answer. We need to work better to be certain we give the information requested and needed.
- Balter: In the past, there were instances when the agency was brutalized when it shared information. We need to be honest in how we will use the information we are given.
- Lazzari: There must be a feeling that it is safe to speak. As a recipient of DHS services, she knows that D&A treatment is a long-term investment that will pay off in the long term. She had to attend to the safety of herself and her children before she could address the need for D&A treatment. The legislature and public needs to be educated that initial investment dollars are the place to spend because they would be nonrecurring and well invested.
- Stiegler: Asked Bruce what other topics he wanted to discuss.
- Goldberg: The findings of the Sensitive Review Committee (SRC) pick up on the transparency he mentioned earlier. Their findings were on organizational improvement and he plans to institutionalize some of them. One way to improve the agency is by looking at cases. Some findings can be implemented through administrative change and some will require legislative action. Sen. Brown and Rep. Krieger will be introducing some legislative concepts as a result of the SRC. DHS' legislative concept on caseworker authority to remove came out of the SRC.
- Foley: *The Oregonian* had two articles by Michelle Cole this week regarding DHS Child Welfare. The specific case described in the articles was originally thought by staff to be one in which they did good casework, but further review found where improvements could be made. We can learn by randomly pulling a file to review. There need not be a fatality first.
- Miller: Appreciates how DHS brought so many partners into the workgroup on the legislative concept regarding caseworker authority to remove. Many concerns about the concept were raised, but she understands it is still moving forward.

- Goldberg: He has heard those concerns. We need to talk about what it is we want to achieve with the concept.
- Miller: The workgroup had some good suggestions on how to make it work without creating an atmosphere in the State Capitol during session that we don't want.
- Goldberg: The concept is still open for discussion.
- Miller: Commended Una Swanson for the job she has done in leading the workgroup.
- Sherbo: She was asked to speak to Sen. Brown, Rep. Krieger and Rep. Schaufler. The SRC found more funds went to prosecution than to the mother or child in that case. The legislators are looking at increasing funding for indigent defense. Ways to guarantee that high quality work is being done must be found. Every bit of information must be known when making important decisions for families. Commended Joe O'Leary for his work in staffing the SRC. Recalled that at one time, CWAC had talked about reviewing a case.

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR'S REPORT – RAMONA FOLEY

TANF REAUTHORIZATION: Vic Todd and Dave Lyda, Office of Self Sufficiency, joined CWAC for this discussion.

- Todd: Shared materials from the American Public Human Services Association (APHSA) titled, "New Direction in Federal Policy." Participation rates do not change with TANF reauthorization, however, there are changes to the category definitions and countable activities. That is concerning to states. The caseload reduction credit is also changed from the 1995 level to the 2005 level. States are losing that credit which plays into the participation rates and the penalties that come with them. States need to avoid panicking. The reality is that if states panic, there is a potential impact on child welfare. If states become more restrictive with their TANF programs, more children may enter foster care. We need to be thoughtful on how TANF programs will look considering the child welfare side. We are seeing increasing numbers in foster care coming from TANF. We want to be sure we act in a way that an outcome is family stability.
- Foley: One reason for Oregon's low participation rate is that when a person gets a job, he/she is cut off TANF. Other states allow some continued assistance. We will be looking at ways to allow some benefits to continue after a person becomes employed.
- Miller: Asked if, in child-only cases, there will be a burden on relatives getting nonneedy grants.

- Lyda: For the most part, no. It was designed to impact states that created nonneedy grants in order to avoid the participation rate.
- Foley: Without our waiver, we now have the confinement of the lifetime restrictions. The child-only grants are excluded from these restrictions. We will be monitoring for how many child-only and how many are participating in the work force.
- Patton: Has concerns about the 5-year lifetime limit, especially for teen parents. Asked if there are exceptions.
- Todd: There can be some exceptions for 5 percent.
- Patton: For teen mothers the focus is to get them employed, so college was not supported.
- Todd: Seeking a four-year degree is not a countable activity in the interim final rules because it is not considered as education directly toward employment. We have a state program, but it would not count. There is an assumption that clients are ready to go to work. The program structures for federal requirements and for reality are different.
- Lazzari: She was unable to live on TANF alone, so she went to school with grants, scholarships and loans. It is unrealistic to have a mother raise her children, work full time and get an education. Asked if there is an increase in childcare rates in the DHS budget.
- Todd: There is additional funding, but it is relatively small compared to the need.
- Lazzari: Asked if the costs paid to childcare providers have been compared to the costs of supporting a mother to stay home and get an education. Family stability is a more important goal than having the mother employed at McDonalds.
- Stiegler: That is an issue to take to one's local congressional representative because these are federal regulations.
- Foley: We will ask Vic and Dave to come to another CWAC meeting when we have more information about the TANF reauthorization.

OREGON CHILD WELFARE SAFETY MODEL – Toni Peterson

- Peterson: Oregon took the concepts in the National Resource Center for Child Protective Services (NRCCPS) safety model and developed the Oregon Child Welfare Safety Model. We are revising our administrative rules. Seventeen sets of revised rules will be released on Friday. Others will be released in October. The rules had to be revised before we could write the procedures

manual. Several components of the procedures manual have been completed. Next week we begin a series of training across the state on the safety model.

- Keeling: These training sessions are for caseworkers, supervisors and SSAs.
- Peterson: It will be followed with training on the administrative rules and procedures manual. This is not a revolutionary change, but an evolution. Our primary goal is to make our safety determination process clear and precise. Our previous language was not clear and precise in telling staff how to determine if a child was safe or not and what actions to take. We also are moving safety into every aspect of the case. All staff will assess safety whenever contact is made with the child. We still have the requirements of the Adoption and Safe Families Act and Oregon statutes for good practice. Cases will continue to move through those requirements.
- Keeling: As the procedures manual is developed, it explains how to confirm a safe environment during a face-to-face visit.
- Miller: The CRB has said it would look at how to assess safety during a CRB review. It would be helpful to have a workgroup including judges and CRB members to talk about how we assess safety in a strength-based way.
- Foley: Staff will be trained first. Then we will go out to judges, CRBs, CASA, etc. We will begin planning for that in the next month or two.
- Sherbo: Referring to the flow chart on “Confirming Safe Environments,” she is concerned that it does not illustrate that children deserve more than being kept safe when in out-of-home care.
- Peterson: Flow charts have their limits and cannot be all-inclusive. She agrees with Angela that many things must occur when a child is in our custody. ASFA and good practice spell out those things. We are adding the safety model on top of those things. While addressing a child’s individual needs, including well-being and health, we are going to be implementing this process of assessing safety.
- Sherbo: Concerned that workers will refer to the flow chart and get the wrong message.
- Waller: Asked how safety is defined.
- Peterson: A child is considered safe when there are either no safety threats (which are spelled out in administrative rule) or the caregiver has the capacity to control the threats.
- Miller: Has some other concerns about this flow chart. It illustrates that when a safety threat is found in an out-of-home placement the only option is to change the placement. There are safety threats in foster care all the time. There are many things a foster parent and caseworker can do other than change the

placement. This flow chart suggests the safety threat cannot be mitigated and requires a change of placement.

- Foley: Staff are receiving two days of training on the safety model. They will have more than just this flow chart for reference.
- Balter: When he read the key concepts of the safety model, he struggled to apply them to adolescents.
- Peterson: The model is designed to address the population DHS Child Welfare is mandated to serve, 0-21. The key concept messages are brief and simplified descriptions to get staff to start thinking about the changes we are making. The rules and procedures will address adolescents.
- Balter: Staff will need to be educated that the flight of a teen from an abusive home does not make the teen safe.
- Patton: Agrees with Mike. The term “immediate and present danger” could be interpreted by workers to mean that when teens run from abusive homes they are safe. However, there is a different kind of danger when they are on the street. The training needs to be clear that a child does not have to be in the home to be in danger.
- Peterson: One of the key concepts also explained “impending danger,” which is where we find our teens. At that minute they are not in immediate danger, but are in impending danger.
- Waller: Going back to Angela Sherbo’s comment, there are things that would be considered safe for a child in his own home, but we would have concerns about in foster care. An example would be a foster parent who agrees to keep a child only if the child is medically restrained. We would allow a parent to do some things as long as they are not illegal that we would not allow a foster parent to do. There may be a need for a separate set of definitions. Removal from a parent’s care is different than removing from foster care. To get the public’s confidence, we need something beyond for safety in foster care.
- Foley: That is a good point. We have talked to the NRCCPS that safety is not only the front end. We have erred on the other side, assuming that a child is safe because he is in licensed care. We need to determine how to look at a child in foster care differently to assure safety.
- Sherbo: Understands that the safety model training is limited to staff only. She is concerned about Mike’s comment about adolescents. Requested that Toni or someone walk CWAC through the safety model.
- Foley: Agreed. It may be scheduled in addition to regular CWAC meetings and would be optional for interested members.

- Balter: That would be helpful so that when a high profile case arises, we understand the concepts.
- Keeling: We are using the same staff to conduct all the training so that employees all hear the same message.
- Stiegler: Asked if CWAC wanted to invite other community partners to this training opportunity. We will try to schedule it in early December.
- Foley: There will be requests for this information from other groups, and the presentation may be tailored for each group's needs.
- Stiegler: We will keep it to CWAC and offer it as an optional meeting outside the regular CWAC meeting.
- Miller: The model court meetings may be a good forum to bring this to the judges.
- Peterson: Implementation of the safety model and revised rules is January 2007.

DOCUMENTING CITIZENSHIP – Michelle Marks

New provisions on documenting citizenship are due to the Deficit Reduction Act. They apply to clients who claim citizenship. For children going into foster care, we are making sure they never lose services. We begin with the assumption they are eligible for Title XIX. Children will be put into benefits and then we will work to get the birth certificates. For the children that will not be able to meet the citizenship requirements, we will move them into General Assistance and they will be covered by state funds.

TCM and BRS REDUCTIONS UPDATE – Ramona Foley and Donna Keddy

- Foley: A meeting will soon be held to talk about Behavioral Rehabilitation Services (BRS) and how they fit in an array of what the federal government is considering. Janet Arenz would be able to provide names of providers interested in joining a focus group for this discussion.
- Keddy: The focus groups will begin in October 2006. She will talk with Janet Arenz and others to set them up.

OTHER

- Foley: DHS is reviewing its conflict of interest policy to determine if there should be a policy of prohibiting DHS staff from being foster parents unless there is a compelling reason, such as a relative or significant relationship. DHS staff serving as foster parents creates a conflict of interest. It would apply to both management and represented staff. We will have more language at the

next meeting. All DHS divisions are reviewing this. We would not displace children's current placements, but have the employee declare the conflict. Mickey Serice is the point of contact about this.

ACTION:

- Possible future agenda items:
 - Invite Jim Scherzinger to a future CWAC meeting
 - Invite Vic Todd and Dave Lyda to another CWAC meeting when we have more information about the TANF reauthorization.
 - November agenda – add update on Conflict of Interest policy (staff as foster parents).
- Schedule an optional meeting for CWAC on the safety model. It will be scheduled as an additional time from a regular CWAC meeting. We will try to schedule it in early December.

Meeting adjourned.