



FINAL

DHS Children, Adults and Families
Child Welfare Advisory Committee
November 8, 2006

Members

- | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dana Ainam | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Don Darland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phil Lemman | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Angela Sherbo by phone | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ruth Taylor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Janet Arenz | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sara Gelser | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nancy Miller | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Becky Smith | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nan Waller |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mike Balter | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Iris Bell for Mickey Lansing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pam Patton | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Christine Stetzer | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leslie Currin | <input checked="" 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"/> Angela Cause |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mickey Serice | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nancy Keeling | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bill Bouska for Madeline Olson | <input type="checkbox"/> Debbi Kraus-Dorn | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bruce Goldberg |

Guests: Kamala Shugar – AAG, Christine Stolebarger, Lori Morphis,
Chris Berger – CASA intern

Minutes Recorded By Pam Pearson

INTRODUCTIONS, AGENDA UPDATE

Because Director Bruce Goldberg, MD, met with CWAC today, the DHS Core Values presentation will be moved to the January 10 meeting.

Nancy Keeling introduced Angela Cause, adoptions manager.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT – BRUCE GOLDBERG, MD

Several child welfare advocates requested postponing the implementation of the draft child welfare rules set to be implemented on January 3, 2007. The advocates are concerned about the quantity of rule changes; changes that we believe will improve our ability to keep children safe. We are working as quickly as possible to move toward the safety model, while also seeking as much input as possible. He understands the need for additional time to digest the rule changes and will revise the timetable as a result.

- Foley: We are considering extending the review period for the first set of rules to January 3 and for the second set of rules to January 10. We will be arranging meetings for advocates to meet with our program managers who were involved

in writing the rules to help answer questions about the rules. With this timeframe, we can implement the rules and procedures on February 21, 2007.

- Sherbo: Has a different proposal to offer. One concern is that the comment period falls during the holiday season, which makes convening these meetings more difficult. Her counterproposal is to extend the comment period to January 31 for both sets of rules and extend the implementation date to March 15, three weeks later than Ramona's proposal.
- Foley: The February 21 date allows partners to read the rules from their perspective and we value that input. We would hold videoconference training on the rules and procedures February 7-9 and implement them on February 21. We must consider the risks involved in moving implementation to March 15: This holds back instructions on how workers conduct face-to-face visits, how to determine if a call receives a 24-hour or 5-day response, or how a worker documents a case. We believe that delaying the implementation of the safety model puts children at risk.
- Goldberg: It is a balance between allowing sufficient time for input and moving forward as quickly as possible.
- Miller: There is the need for sufficient time for input and also time to make changes based on that input. Policies already address when a call receives a 24-hour response or within a certain number of days so she does not see the postponement as a safety risk. If you don't allow enough time to receive and respond to input, the perception is that the input is meaningless.
- Foley: Believes her proposal allows adequate time. Some of the rule changes are clean up to accurately reflect current law. We were geared up for a January 3 implementation. This is the most important thing we are doing in child welfare at this time.
- Miller: The date of implementation is not much different, but gives more time for input given the reality of the upcoming holiday season.
- Goldberg: This feedback has been helpful and we will make a final decision.
- Patton: An example of why more time is needed is the Multnomah County Child Welfare Advisory Committee. Extending the time means their next meeting will fall within the review period and will give them an opportunity to have input. It also gives more time to clarify with child welfare staff the interpretations of the rules.
- Foley: Those are some of the reasons why we are planning meetings separate from the official administrative rule public hearing process to invite advocates to meet with us to discuss the safety model and the rules. The final decision on

the postponement of the rules will be announced through the usual rulemaking process.

- Goldberg: Moving on to another topic, he asked for CWAC input on the issues of how to keep children safe and the increasing numbers in foster care. He asked what two things could and should DHS do over the next year to assure more children are safe in this state and how to change the increasing need for foster care. The goal is to decrease the need for foster care, while at the same time assure children are safer. CWAC can respond as a group or individually. He would appreciate a group response following some thought and strategy.

Members were given an opportunity to state their top two ideas:

Angela Sherbo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More D&A and mental health treatment. • No contracts for placements that, by their terms, are time-limited because they add to the number of placement moves for children. • More relative placements.
Phil Lemman	Passed.
Nan Waller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed with Sherbo. • Minimize the number of moves for children. • Respect for the attachments children need. • Address the disproportionate number of minority children. Referred to a Casey study that should be distributed to CWAC. • Stabilize the workforce.
Nancy Miller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assign cases to people that don't have them. The caseworker to case ratio is 1:20, but caseloads are much higher because of the number of non-case-carrying positions. • No more than two workers per case. The current system builds in four.
Becky Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agrees with previous suggestions. • Look at caseworker movements at the Family Decision Meetings.
Christine Stetzer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D&A and mental health treatment. • More in-home help and training for parents under the DHS umbrella.

Iris Bell (for Mickey Lansing)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify barriers in the social service delivery systems and actually remove them.
Pam Patton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agrees with Iris Bell. The authority and responsibility of the overall system impacts a child's life. Eliminate barriers to allow systems to be flexible so that the child gets what he needs. Training for foster parents and caseworkers on how to work with the children in their care, specialized by age and development.
Rep. Sara Gelser	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For children with disabilities: staff need the skills to interview them and the resources to deal with them. Foster parents need training on how to serve them.
Ruth Taylor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D&A and mental health treatment. Increase the number of treatment beds where the children can stay with their parent. Support to parents at the outset of the case. Develop a community norm where it is acceptable for parents to ask for help.
Christine Stolebarger, guest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training and education to get out of poverty. D&A abuse prevention.
Jean Lasater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuing or emphasizing collaborative relationships. Out-of-the-box creative thinking that starts with the child.
Don Darland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agrees with what others have said. Annual cruise to Alaska for Don and Bruce. ☺
Bill Bouska for Madeline Olson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D&A and mental health treatment. Have each community set a target number by which to reduce the number of placements each year.
Leslie Currin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> D&A and mental health treatment. Access to medical and dental care.
Lori Morphis, guest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-house treatment for parents and children.

- Goldberg: Appreciates the enthusiasm and input and requested further discussion by CWAC to come to consensus on two.

- Stiegler: The Future Issues Work Group will fine-tune this list to bring back to CWAC.
- Waller: Suggested making it part of the core values discussion that was postponed from today's agenda.

ACTION: The CWAC Future Issues Work Group will refine the list at their December 5 meeting. At the January 10, 2007, CWAC meeting we will bring together a discussion of the core values and this list. CWAC will be asked to come to consensus on two ideas at their January 10, 2007, meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The September 13, 2006, CWAC minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF PRINCIPLES FOR CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM CHANGE

The 11/1/2006 draft of the "Principles for Child Welfare System Change" were approved with one amendment as shown below:

- ★ There cannot be a conversation about system change without having a conversation about resources. Any conversation about change must ~~begin with~~ include a discussion on the adequacy and appropriate allocation of current resources. Additionally, when resources are limited and circumstances demand, the system should be guided by these principles when making decisions on the allocation of those resources.
- Stiegler: The initial intent of these principles was to respond to Rep. Dalto. We also considered it becoming a broader document to use in conversations with legislators and change agents.
- Waller: Hopes that CWAC members take it to their communities and committees.
- Stiegler: A finalized version will be provided to CWAC members to use in our conversations.
- Waller: It should also be sent to the Governor's Office.
- Miller: Also send it to Rep. Krieger, as his main legislative agenda will be dependency.

- Foley: It should also be sent to Bruce Goldberg and DHS staff.

ACTION: Judy Stiegler will prepare a cover letter to the Principles. It will be sent to DHS Director Bruce Goldberg, DHS staff, the Governor's Office, Rep. Krieger and others as we identify them. CWAC members will share it with their constituencies.

DEFINITIONAL CHANGES – SPECIAL NEEDS CHILDREN

- Keeling: Rep. Richardson asked Ramona to look at how Oregon defines “special needs.” She distributed materials titled, “Special Needs Definition,” that gives the federal definition and how Oregon’s definition aligns with other states.
- Serice: We told Rep. Richardson that we would bring the issue to CWAC to review the current definitions and to offer revisions that might be appropriate. We will need to close that loop with Rep. Richardson.
- Waller: Asked if “special needs” is defined here for the purposes of adoption assistance only.
- Keeling: Yes.
- Foley: While Rep. Richardson brought this to our attention, so have others. Adoption assistance makes it easier to place children.
- Waller: Oregon pays a special rate foster care, which impacts how we measure with other states for adoption assistance.
- Foley: It has not been possible to get all states to define “special needs” alike. Rep. Richardson’s question was whether we should change the definition of special needs for the purposes of adoption assistance. We could not make that decision alone because of the history behind how we currently define it. We do not want to jeopardize anything that will affect children being adopted, but we also recognize that we have quadrupled the adoption assistance budget. We are asking if we need to revisit the definition because of this increase.
- Keeling: One category in the definition we may want to change is that currently any sibling group of three is considered a special need regardless of the ages of the children.
- Patton: One reason for the rising number of adoptions may be because of the assistance given to adopt sibling groups.
- Foley: What we don’t know is whether or not this definition or another definition in another state has increased the number of adoptions.

- Darland: Asked if there are statistics that show the number of adoptions comparing those receiving adoption assistance and those that do not.
- Keeling: We can get that information. Some receive only a medical card, some receive full assistance and some receive none.
- Darland: Most children in sibling groups have been in the system for some time and have major problems. DHS does not take “normal” children and adopt them out.
- Cause: The definitions are there to indicate these are factors that create barriers to adoption and achieving permanency. Oregon has said that a being part of a sibling group of three is such a barrier. Another is being in a sibling group of two if one child is over age 6. Adoption assistance is meant to help families meet the special needs the children brought with them when they came into foster care.
- Waller: Multnomah County has some of the highest special rate foster care payments. Asked how that plays out in the numbers receiving adoption assistance.
- Keeling: Special rates in foster care can be higher than adoption assistance. We can get that information for you.
- Waller: In some cases, the special rate in foster care becomes the barrier to adoption.
- Miller: Foster parents see no reason to agree to adopt when permanent foster care gives them a higher rate.
- Darland: If more is done to return children home such as better D&A treatment, then perhaps the adoption assistance budget will decrease because fewer children will need adoption.
- Foley: One of the tensions is that families are not getting services at the front door. The public lacks confidence in DHS child welfare and feels that we have been ignoring the front door, driving cases toward adoption. Also, we are required to tell adoptive parents about adoption assistance, regardless of their income level. Most adoptive parents choose to accept the assistance.
- Keeling: Asked if a smaller group should meet with Angela Cause to develop a recommendation to bring back to CWAC.
- Darland: We need to make an informed decision. Reducing the adoption assistance budget should not be the only reason to change the definition.
- Foley: Rep. Richardson would likely be willing to meet with CWAC to discuss the issue of sustainability of the program.
- Stiegler: We will take this to the Future Issues Work Group.

- Stetzer: On the handout, the second bullet quoting Oregon Child Welfare Policy says "...other identified predisposing factor that places the child at risk..." Does that include educational needs?
- Foley: That is one of the categories receiving the most criticism because it is so broad.

ACTION: On December 5, 2006, the Future Issues Work Group will develop recommendations for changing the definition of "special needs" as it is used for adoption assistance. The discussion will be overlaid with our Principles document. Angela Cause will attend FIWG. CWAC members that do not regularly attend FIWG are welcome to attend.

DEFINITIONAL CHANGES – PREFERENCE FOR RELATIVES and CURRENT CARETAKER RULES

- Keeling: The Sensitive Issue Review Committee's recommendations included looking at how Oregon defines preference to relatives with relatives. Changing the definition may result in giving the current caretaker equal preference. The current caretaker policy would then need to be changed. The sense in Oregon is that we rule relatives out rather than give them preference, especially when the relative lives a distance away. We need to be up front with foster parents that a child is not available for adoption when that child has a viable relationship with a relative. This agency does need to make a statement that gives preference to relatives. Referred to distributed materials that show the proposed language changes in the policies.
- Miller: The language is not strong enough and is not in line with ORS 419b.192, which specifically states that preference is to be given to certain relatives.
- Waller: Concerned with how this fits in with the timeline for permanency in the Oregon Safety Model. The timeline shows that the relative search and identification occurs at 180 days. Waiting until 180 days is not good for children.
- Peterson: Clarified that the search and identification must conclude at 180 days, not begin.
- Waller: Identification of relatives needs to be earlier. If reunification is not viable and no relatives are found, work can begin sooner with the foster parent and child.

- Peterson: Agrees. We need to tell the caretaker that a search is being done for relatives and that relatives are the first choice for placement. That needs to start within days of placement. The search may take longer than 30 days if relatives are outside the local community and the state.
- Keeling: Some states do not allow adoption home studies unless the child is free for adoption.
- Waller: It is human nature to work up to the deadline. If workers have 180 days, they will take that amount of time.
- Keeling: Believes this has been addressed in the procedure manual.
- Gelser: If a relative has a relationship with the child, why would it take so long to find out? Some qualifier of relationship is needed with emotional ties considered over blood ties.
- Stiegler: There are situations where the child has a relationship with the non-relative caretaker prior to the placement. A definition is needed that responds to these circumstances.
- Sherbo: Her concern includes the manner in which DHS searches for relatives. It is pro forma by certified letter and not a genuine search. The rule that automatically writes off the current caretaker violates the principles we just adopted in which we state the system needs to individualize its response to the needs of each child. She would not be able to agree to this rule.
- Waller, Miller: Agree with Sherbo.
- Keeling: Work on a good reunification plan must occur first.
- Waller: An individualized response looks at every child's needs. Some children yearn for biological family. Some are so traumatized that a move from the only safe home they have known would be devastating. The rule needs to require that the search for relatives begin on day one and be a diligent search.
- Foley: The Sensitive Issue Review Committee looked at a specific relative that should have been given more serious consideration and that raised this issue. The committee wanted us to know we have an inconsistent approach to relatives. We need to align our rules on this obligation.
- Sherbo: The statutes say "consideration of preference."
- Miller: ORS 192 talks about "shall give preference."
- Foley: The Sensitive Issue Review Committee asked for consistency.
- Miller: This rule is not consistent with statute.
- Keeling: How do you reconcile to give preference to relatives when, in six months, you give the current caretaker equal standing?

- Miller: How can you give the current caretaker equal standing in six months with the current statutes?
- Sherbo: Supports relative placement and believes that would shrink foster care numbers.
- Morphis: Loving parents are going to let their children visit their previous caretakers.
- Stiegler: Should we tee this up further?
- Foley: There are multiple issues here including: the issue raised by the Sensitive Issue Review Committee and an assumption from years ago, based on best practice, that we should immediately find relatives and give them preference. We need to review the exact language of the SIRC's recommendations and bring that back to CWAC.
- Sherbo: Use this issue as a first conversation using our principles.

ACTION: The exact language of the SIRC's recommendations will be sent to CWAC for further discussion.

OREGON SAFETY MODEL – TONI PETERSON, NANCY KEELING

The process to develop the safety model is similar to the process used in 1997 when ASFA became effective. Changes to state statutes and rules for Oregon's model for permanency were made to be consistent with that federal law. Two years ago, we learned from Wayne Holder that we did not have a comprehensive model or consistent practice in safety. The focus of the National Resource Center on Child Protective Services (NRCCPS) is at the front end (CPS) of a case. Oregon is adopting the NRCCPS model, but expanding it to provide clarity and precision throughout the life of a case. A procedures manual will help implement and perform the safety model. DHS' responsibility for safety does not end after the CPS assessment. It is important to reassess safety at critical points, such as when the child is returned home, when placed in out-of-home care or relative placement, or when moved into an adoptive placement. The goal is to have consistent practice throughout the state. We made advances in consistency of assessing reports of abuse with the Guided Assessment Process, but practice still varies. We realize we will never have 100% consistency, but we must strive towards it. In rewriting and creating new rules, we have rewritten definitions, moving away from "risk" to focus on safety, looking at safety threats, child vulnerability and caregiver capacity. They are applied based on the circumstances,

age of the child and the parents' capacity. A concern has been raised about teens. With Ramona's arrival in 1999 we made a strong commitment to address concerns of teens and we have moved forward. We are not stepping away from that. This model recognizes that child vulnerability crosses all age groups.

Some rule changes are clean up and necessary even without the implementation of the safety model. We found different definitions for the same terms and some rules that conflicted with each other. These situations occurred over the rule writing process across many years. Our goal is to have more consistency and remove the conflicting definitions. However, we are releasing them under the umbrella of the safety model release. There will also be some rule changes due to the Adam Walsh federal legislation.

We are completing staff training on the safety model. This training is conceptual. It is not training on the rules or procedure manual. The goal is that staff will see it is an integrated approach to serving children and a move away from a practice that sees safety as something that only applies to the first 30 days of a case. We have a statutory requirement to address safety, permanency and well being of the child.

- Swanson: Learning the model and talking to staff reinforced that we did not have a model before. When safety becomes our primary focus and we reconfirm it over and over, we step up or step down our intrusion accordingly. The NRCCPS model and research from other states gave us tools for staff to use when determining child safety.
- Keeling: This model crafts what to do at face-to-face contacts and how to confirm safety.
- Foley: We already see good practice, but it is random. This model will give citizens and parents more confidence that workers are following a script of procedures when making the decision to remove or return a child.
- Darland: This has a huge impact for foster parents who will be held to a higher standard of safety. How it is being trained is critical. It needs to be trained that the worker and foster parent are working together to assure safety. In the past, the assumption was that when a child is in a foster home, the child is safe. This reevaluates safety. Adding one more child to a foster home may mean a child already in the home is no longer safe. He is concerned about some workers having an attitude of coming into the foster home looking to report something. He holds accountability on the supervisors, but hears some supervisors say that they don't question the decisions of their workers.

- Foley: Supervisors should not be saying that they don't question their workers. We want a supervisor to worker ratio that allows a supervisor to know what is happening in every case. She also acknowledged a cultural change occurred when we moved to 30-day face-to-face contacts. When contacts were required every 90 days, everything was downloaded to the foster parents and the workers came only to investigate concerns. Staff should be spending more time with the child, foster parent and birth parent so they can anticipate problems. Workers need to work closely with foster parents in building support and accepting the responsibility DHS has to that child.
- Patton: The Multnomah County Child Welfare Advisory Committee's concern is that the safety model training is conceptual. Past experience with conceptual training (on needs-based services and the level system) reduced services to teens. They are concerned that the model has language that says vulnerability is based on the age of the child and harm comes only from a perpetrator. Teens may run from danger and put themselves in an unsafe situation. You won't change a system by creating a policy. You have to get the workers behind the policy shift. She is concerned workers will not understand how the safety model works for teens. Another concern is whether or not the assessment for safety issues will look at neglect, which is also considered abuse. The answer to question 1B in Ramona's 11/1/06 letter to the Multnomah County CWAC concerns her.
- Swanson. A safety threat is a family behavior and includes a child's behavior. It is not considered from a perpetrator standpoint. Pam's points about child vulnerability are well taken. We are in the beginning of an ongoing process. The concept of child vulnerability has been captured well in the safety model. Agrees there is a natural tendency to consider age, but the model looks beyond age because children are so unique. We can name the abuse or neglect and say if it is "major" or "minor." However, the impact of the abuse or neglect on the victim can only be determined by the victim. Likewise with vulnerability: it can only be determined by the victim. We can determine vulnerability only by getting to know the children and their experiences of the circumstances that led us to believe they were unsafe. We are moving away from age as an indicator. With older children, we reinforce the need to interview the child to learn the child's experience.
- Foley: Our message is not that if a child is big enough to get away, then the child is safe and it is not about a level system. We have reinforced that in every training.

- Patton: However, the definitions say "...can get away." Suggested changing that and prefacing it with Una's language above.
- Swanson: A child's capacity for self-protection has nothing to do with running away. Agrees that it should be re-written so running away is not considered the default. Questions from staff have also shown us we need to change this language.
- Miller: On the last page of Ramona's letter to the Multnomah County CWAC it says, "If a threat to a child's safety exists in a substitute care placement, the department will no longer be creating safety plans for that child to remain in the placement." Is concerned about this automatic removal.
- Swanson. The training goes further and it is clearer in the rule and procedure that the child will be removed if the caregiver is the safety threat. After a child is placed in substitute care, it is the department's responsibility to assure the child's safety and well being, and the placement setting must be held to a higher safety standard than the child's own home. If the foster provider poses a threat to a child's safety, the department will no longer be creating safety plans for that child to remain in the placement. (This is a "Key Concept" called Confirming Safe Environments.) However, it should be noted that we will continue to work closely with foster parents, using foster family support plans when such plans are appropriate.
- Foley: We will revise the letter to the Multnomah County CWAC to incorporate these comments.
- Miller: Another concern is that the timeline says the service agreement is to be completed in 90 days; however, law requires them in 60 days. A 90-day timeline is not aligned with the court doing dispositions.
- Peterson: Cautioned that this timeline is a condensed version that does not provide all the details.
- Miller: Concerns that having it in writing even on a condensed version may cause it to happen in practice. Recommended that safety staffings occur before CRB and permanency hearings.
- Stolebarger: For teens and older children, even if they can get away from physical harm, the longer-term effect is emotional.
- Darland: Using the Guided Assessment Process for allegations of abuse in foster care may help. Workers tend to err on the side of caution and remove the child during the review process. However, if the allegation is unfounded, the child is not always returned to a home where the child may have been doing well.

- Foley: We are going to have more open conversations with CASAs and the child's attorney to bring them into the collective thinking so that the worker does not have to take responsibility to make these decisions alone. It is better practice to have others involved.
- Lemman: OYA wants to have better engagement with CPS in working together for the older youth in foster care, residential care and correctional facilities.
- Lasater: The Runaway and Homeless Subcommittee of Partners for Children and Families held forums around the state regarding the issues of the runaway and homeless population. They heard that the intentions around safety and well being of teens are slow in trickling down and there is a gap in communities in their services to teens. All communities reported that there is a lack of continuity, connectiveness and resources. While this is an internal discussion, the services happen in a community. These youth are prohibited from finding solutions. One frequent issue for providers of services to the runaway and homeless youth population is that when a shelter makes a report of abuse, the child is not considered to be in imminent danger because the child is in the shelter. When the shelter placement ends, the child may go back to the unsafe situation.
- Swanson: Calls from shelters reporting abuse in a child's home need to be accepted and the screener is wrong to say the child is safe.
- Peterson: The timeline represents only a 15-minute portion of the 2-day training. The presentation and packets included much greater detail that cannot be seen on the timeline.
- Miller: Concerned that staff have already been trained before DHS has heard CWAC's concerns. What is CWAC's role if not given the ability to provide timely comment? Also concerned about the written materials the workers takes from the training if that material's condensation results in information that could be misunderstood without the fuller dialogue heard in the training.
- Peterson: We are not changing statutes or ASFA timelines and will reiterate that to staff. Nancy Miller's recommendations about holding the safety staffing before the CRB and permanency hearing are excellent.
- Stiegler: There was no nefarious intent to keep CWAC out of the loop. Today's conversation is an effort to get CWAC on track with the safety model. She has heard varying levels of acceptance and responsiveness by staff to the training.

- Peterson: The move to strengths-needs based services took years to get staff on board. We are seeing the same levels of resistance and acceptance; however, have received a lot of positive feedback along with the criticisms.
- Sherbo: Going back to the definition of a safety plan, there is only a definition of an “ongoing safety plan.” The terms are not consistent in the rules or in the letter to the Multnomah County CWAC. Those who understand the model best are here today. This major philosophical position is not understood by those who attended the training and by those partners who see nothing more than 400 pages of rules.
- Stiegler: CAF management has lived and breathed it for quite some time. There is a gradual process of receptivity and understanding.
- Miller: Asked that CWAC be allowed to review the procedure manual. There was an earlier decision to not have CWAC review it before it was released. She expects that CWAC will find areas of concern in the manual and the committee should be given the opportunity to review it in advance.
- Swanson: The goal of the 2-day training was to introduce the safety model concept and allow time for staff to absorb the concept before seeing the rules. There is no expectation that staff will be competent in the model after two days of training. It is the beginning of a long process. Change is difficult and part of the resistance is that workers can no longer do things the same way they did before.
- Peterson: We worked with a team of AAGs to write the rules. They were reviewed by NRCCPS. The rule comment period exists for the purpose of gathering comments. We will make revisions to the rules and procedures before we begin training on them.
- Stiegler: The point being made is that even in an introduction to a concept, any conflict to rule will create tension and needs to be addressed. If the agency is going down the wrong path, it needs to be dealt with. This is the caution that is being raised.

ACTION: The letter to the Multnomah County CWAC will be revised and sent to Pam Patton and CWAC.

Meeting adjourned.