



FINAL

DHS Children, Adults and Families
Child Welfare Advisory Committee
June 13, 2007

Members

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

DHS Staff

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ramona Foley | <input type="checkbox"/> Jim Neely | <input 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: Kamala Shugar – AAG, Christine Stolebarger, Diane Cohen-Alpert, Kevin George, Michelle Cole

Minutes Recorded By Pam Pearson

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

- Goldberg: Asked if there are questions for him as we head to the end of the legislative session. Thanked the committee for its input on ways to keep children safer. We are moving forward on CWAC's recommendations.
- Waller: Asked for an update on the DHS budget.
- Goldberg: The budget bill had a work session in Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Services yesterday. A number of changes were made to the co-chairs' budget including restoration of Employment Related Day Care and legal representation cuts. TANF program additions are above what was in the Governor's Recommended Budget and include providing TANF Extended Medical to families that are in post-TANF, improvements in the sanctions policy and having MSWs working in enhanced assessments.

SB 282 had a hearing yesterday. It moves DHS in the direction of paying relative foster care payments. CWAC previously discussed the means test. We should be providing these payments regardless of the relative's income; however, resource allocations meant we could only move in that direction for now.

- Sherbo: In this case, budget drove a policy decision. There are 7,700 children in foster care every day. We pay foster parents for all but 207 of them. The committee agreed that DHS should pay relative foster parents and the money

should be found. Funding was found to restore the legal representation package, a staffing POP and a \$3 million reduction in special rates. Where can we find \$1.4 million to end this shameful practice? Would like to be in a position where JRP and DHS go to Senator Carter together saying money has been found to fund all relative foster payments. Can we do that?

- Goldberg: We are on the same page, policy-wise, to do this. We do not want to pit one program against another, but he is open to creative ideas to fund it. He agrees budget drove the policy. What if we say it is our policy to pay relatives – period – and that DHS is being instructed to begin to implement that policy? We do not know what it will cost. We are instructed to begin by supporting the lowest income families and go to the E-Board for additional funding.
- Sherbo: Suggested an alternate proposal: to pass the amendments to the bill that eliminate the means test and go to the E-Board to explain that DHS did not get enough money to implement the legislation. She does not know what a court will say about discriminating against a subgroup. It would take a small amount of money from a number of places to fund payments for this last population.
- Goldberg: We do not have a difference of opinion on the policy. We are moving it forward to get where we want to go.
- Foley: This is the first legislative session in which we have not been asked why we pay relatives at all.
- Goldberg: We are in a better place than we were last session. Because he had to leave at this time, he suggested CWAC have a discussion to see if the dollars can be found.
- Patton: Asked about funding for alcohol and drug treatment.
- Goldberg: Predicts SB 184 probably will not pass, but the dollars to support the treatment for parents will be in the DHS General Fund budget.

AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Stiegler: Gave an overview of today's agenda.
- March 14, 2007, minutes: With a change on page 12, to correct "date" to "data" in Benjamin Hazelton's comment, the minutes were approved.

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PROCESS

- Stiegler: We have worked on a process over the last two years to revamp how issues come to CWAC ready for discussion and action. Each member has concerns and issues and a process was needed to bring them to the group. We

have made progress. Our products include our operating procedures, Principles for Child Welfare System Change, and most recently, our recommendations to DHS on what to do to keep children safe and help prevent foster care. The Future Issues Work Group (FIWG) acts as the clearinghouse for issues. FIWG has an ongoing list, updated as members raise concerns, that is used to decide what to attack next. At the last FIWG meeting, FIWG decided to give some thought to where the committee should go from here; how to be more proactive and how to approach issues in the future. Mike Balter was the original author of the “Continuous Improvement Process” paper. Today we want to bounce back to CWAC a discussion on how to go about the process, including opportunities to bring issues to the Legislature next session.

- Sherbo: Suggested the discussion begin with the questions on page two of the discussion paper, particularly #3 and #4. The answer to #1 is probably no, because the interests of the committee members are so diverse. She asked for comment from Ramona on #3 and #4.

From “Continuous Improvement Process” – questions referred to above by Angela Sherbo (bullets changed to numbers to aid in the CWAC discussion here):

1. Should the CWAC issue advocacy positions or policy recommendations to legislative committees independent of the Department. (I.e. should the recent recommendations to Dr. Goldberg be sent to a legislative committee?)
2. Should CWAC take positions and send recommendations to Ways and Means regarding Policy Option Packages proposed by CAF?
3. Does DHS/CAF want earlier input or advice on major policy activities like the safety model or is post-development reaction preferred?
4. Does DHS/CAF want early advice or consultation from CWAC on responses to major challenges and reports like the Holder report or the NRCOI report or major management decisions like the staffing changes in the recent policy option package?
5. With the new capacity identified above, the CWAC may be better able to respond to these types of opportunities.

- Foley: Regarding #3, early advice is helpful. The dilemma is how to align it with other directives. Gave the example of staffing changes. A work group was established at Bruce Goldberg’s direction that is less program-focused and has more involvement with SEIU. CWAC is interested in staffing changes, but when we are considering changing position descriptions and eliminating positions, the impact is greater than that which falls within CWAC’s area of advice. There is a more global impact. #3 also mentions the safety model. We would have liked to have developed the model in consultation with stakeholders; however, we needed to get a safety model in place as quickly as possible and that did not permit us to seek stakeholder input while it was being

developed. We did not have a safety model in place that was making children safe and what we did have was interpreted differently across the state. The national experts visited Oregon to see what we had. They brought us the safety model as it pertains to DHS' responsibility to keep children safe. The model is in place in DHS. We can now consider the interface with the courts, CRB, and other partners. The National Resource Center for Child Protective Services is developing a manual for the court's role in the safety model. Ramona anticipates it will be released this summer. We have an opportunity at this time to determine what pieces were lost or are not as visible as before the model was implemented. As for #3, she would always prefer input early in the process. An example of something that we had the ability to get CWAC input on is face-to-face visits. She plans to visit communities after session to hear conversations about such issues. Judge Waller has a list of specific things we can measure to show if the model is keeping children safer. There may be other things to measure as well. Staff are feeling the Oregon Safety Model is more explicit and is asking them things that help them in their work.

- Waller: Early involvement of this diverse committee gives the benefit of hearing multiple perspectives. When DHS doesn't involve a committee like this early on, it loses the vitality of the different perspectives. CWAC can make the department stronger.
- Cohen-Alpert: In response to Ramona's comment about visiting communities after session, invited Ramona to meet with the Multnomah County Child Welfare Advisory Committee. They have been focusing on many of these same issues.
- Foley: Would be happy to meet with the Multnomah County Child Welfare Advisory Committee. Her community visits will include time with legislators and press and are a normal part of her work between sessions. We want to make sure staff are not interpreting the model incorrectly, thinking that there are some things they can no longer do. Staff also need to understand their role with partners; that safety is DHS' responsibility and we cannot compromise safety to reach consensus with partners. We want to add measures to our evaluations to determine if the model meets the goal that children are safer. We have much data we can use, including measurements to determine if the model is being implemented for teens.
- Patton: Every system change results in similar things for staff. The evaluation and training must be a priority. Is hopeful CWAC can help make these the priorities, provide input on what needs to be measured and that there is a reporting process.

- Sherbo: Understands that the procedure manual only addresses the role and responsibility of DHS and not of external partners. It is difficult to understand the answers and who gave them for some of the frequently asked questions posted online for the Oregon Safety Model. Requested some clarification about two issues which arose in Multnomah County after a presentation by DHS to the juvenile court community. Asks that Ramona send an email to staff, as she recently did clarifying issues around Team Decision Meetings, explaining that:
 - a) the OSM does not mean that voluntary services may never be offered (as some staff interpret it to mean) and
 - b) that lawyers are welcome at child safety meetings (some staff believe they may not attend and the document at the meeting was ambiguous).Recommends that responses for CWAC's questions on the OSM also be sent to staff. Suggestions of measurements:
 - How many first placements were with relatives.
 - If the least restrictive method was used to keep children safe.
- Foley: Agrees with circulating the answers to CWAC's questions statewide. When she met with Judge Waller and Kay Toran this week, it became apparent that there were many versions of Team Decision Meetings. What Judge Waller described is that court needs as much information as possible for shelter hearings. Having the worker meet with the parents and others to determine what the issues are and what to recommend for the least restrictive placement means the worker is not making the decision in isolation.
- Waller: The TDM was more organized and was an opportunity to pull all parties together just before the shelter hearing. Having a facilitator other than the caseworker helps get more information.
- Foley: The OSM did not intend the worker would go to court without that prior conversation.
- Stiegler: Other jurisdictions than Multnomah County have difference practices and experiences. The practice of the particular court makes an impact. In Deschutes County, there is no institutionalized opportunity for such a meeting to occur before the shelter hearing. They may have a meeting immediately after the shelter hearing.
- Waller: The question becomes: How does a judge get the best information on which to make decisions when there is little time between removal and the shelter hearing? If a process is missing across the state by which judges can get that information (such as identification of relatives and how to keep the child in the home), then such a process needs to be established statewide. The court will make the decisions at the shelter hearing regardless of how much information is available at the time.

- Stiegler: The issue is how to operationalize that kind of practice when looking at such a short period of time.
- Sherbo: TDMs were not unique to Multnomah County. They were part of a statewide policy, focused on safety and were required before shelter hearings. The OSM eliminated them. . Asks Nancy Keeling for confirmation that TDMs were in policy statewide and that there was a single model.
- Keeling: Yes.
- Foley: We are committed to a statewide practice whose goal is that the parent knows what is going on before the shelter hearing. In Multnomah County, the TDMs were more seamless because they were housed in the courthouse.
- Waller: At the initial hearing, the judge looks at certain statutory items such as least restrictive and reasonable efforts. TDMs provided a way to get more information to help answer those questions.
- Taylor: Another value of the TDM is that the parents could see that they could be actively involved. If the focus is on the safety of the child, it is not as likely that the parent will be engaged.
- Foley: We are committed to keeping the parent engaged early on even if the parental capacity assessment is not completed.
- Patton: The strengths of the parent also need to be determined.
- Keeling: We still have strength-based family meetings, but not at the time of the child safety meeting.
- Patton: It is not a thing but an approach that can happen at the start of a case.
- Foley: The OSM implementation team meets on Monday. She will relay to them Angela's suggestion to clarify the FAQs. We want to be explicit in spelling out the role and responsibility of DHS staff. Because there are variations in systems across the state, we should not be surprised when data differs. It is Oregon's model and it will take the effort of DHS, CWAC and others to make it keep children safe.
- Waller: It appears that the trend is that we get better outcomes with collaborative decision making. Merging the OSM with the principles DHS has embraced will engage families, build on their strengths and bring in the community. There should be nothing at odds with merging these. Safety is not compromised by collaborative decisions that are strength-based.
- Foley: Workers should not want to climb out on the decision making limb alone. We want workers to understand and respect the court's authority in a case and not personalize the court's decisions.

- Stiegler: We need to develop a process to bring issues of concern about the OSM to DHS. Is CWAC to only react to what DHS brings to the committee or do more?
- Foley: Reacting only would be a waste of the talent of this group.
- Sherbo: As these questions are raised by CWAC and clarified by DHS, will an email be sent to staff?
- Foley: Yes.
- Patton: How will the information get to CWAC. How do we reach consensus on what information we want from DHS? CWAC would want the information prior to their next meeting.
- Foley: Members can submit a list of questions and suggestions for measurements, such as measuring whether or not we are placing with relatives.
- Patton: Asked if we can start building the list today rather than waiting for the September meeting.
- Stiegler: Any CWAC member has the ability to make individual requests to DHS, separate from the full CWAC advice to the department. The “Continuous Improvement Process” is to operationalize the “big-picture” requests outside the individual requests that members can do on their own. Can we set into place a process so that we are not only a reactive body, but one that brings issues as a committee to the department?
- Patton: CWAC is interested in the success of the OSM.
- Foley: We can use Judge Waller’s notes as a starting point and ask CWAC to add to that list. We can then let CWAC know if the items they suggest can be measured or not. Reports can be sent to CWAC regularly on the measurements.
- Patton: Measurement questions on teens should be by gender to determine if more boys or girls are coming in and going out.
- Serice: Suggested a CWAC subcommittee to look at the OSM. Some CWAC members are more vested in the OSM than others.
- Foley: This issue is far reaching and critical. The subcommittee would include members who want to be more involved in helping move it forward. It will be good to receive direct feedback as issues come to the forefront.
- Sherbo: In the FAQs, please look at supervisors training that a 12-year-old is considered safe after the child’s parents were arrested for meth. The definition of vulnerability should have been reviewed by CWAC sooner. Some mistakes in the OSM may have been avoided had there been earlier input by CWAC (such as in the definition of vulnerability, use of meetings early in a case). It is better to have input before something is final. Agrees to the idea of a subcommittee.

- Stiegler: Also agrees to a subcommittee, but guards against too many subcommittees because of the limited staff resources available to CWAC. The Future Issues Work Group may be a misnomer, but it is the standing committee that sifts issues. In the immediate time, before a subcommittee is set, the process to send OSM questions in will be for CWAC members to send them to Pam Pearson.

- ACTION:**
- **The Future Issues Work Group will continue today's discussion during their next meeting.**
 - **CWAC questions regarding the OSM may be sent to Pam Pearson. Answers will be sent to both CWAC and child welfare staff and posted online.**
 - **A CWAC subcommittee will be formed to develop recommendations on measurements for quality assurance in the OSM.**
 - ✓ **CWAC members interested in the subcommittee: Benjamin Hazelton, Pam Patton, Angela Sherbo, Judy Stiegler, Judge Nan Waller**
 - ✓ **Suggested measurements received today:**
 - **Number of first placements with relatives.**
 - **Was the least restrictive method used to keep the child safe?**
 - **Are the child's and parent's attorneys invited to child safety meetings?**
 - **Measurements regarding teens should be gender specific.**

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR'S REPORT – RAMONA FOLEY

There is a federal grant opportunity for grants to help children affected by meth and Ramona reported that Commissioner Joan Ohl, Administration for Children, Youth and Families, expects a good showing of applications from Oregon.

Ramona suggested several topics for discussion: CFSR, face-to-face visits, the staffing policy option package (POP), legal representation measures and outcomes, and guns in foster homes. The staffing POP's goal is to achieve lower caseloads, more adequate supervision and consistency of practice.

Legal Representation Measures and Outcomes

The material in the agenda packet on legal representation measures and outcomes was shared with Ways and Means yesterday. Rep. Kotek is very interested; we have strong advocates in the Legislative Assembly on children's issues. These are our initial measures, developed with DOJ input, showing what differences are occurring as a result of adding the legal representation.

- Waller: It may not be appropriate to include the measurement of number of hearings. As courts are raising the importance of child welfare cases, the number of hearings may increase.
- Foley: An added hearing in the first 12 months may mean children are returning home sooner. We expect the measurement of time to reunification to go down.
- Waller: As more lawyers are involved and appropriately addressing issues, she would expect more hearings to be held because we would be resolving issues that otherwise may not have been resolved.
- Foley: Research Analyst Anna Cox is writing a narrative explaining what the measures mean.
- Shugar: While this is information for FY 2006, we were not fully staffed until July 2006. We hope to see more significant changes in 2007.
- Foley: It is an evolving product. If we find better measurements, we will use them. If CWAC members have suggestions on what to measure, please let us know. = ACTION
- Stiegler: You must be careful deciding what to measure because it could actually reflect something different than what you intended.
- Stetzer: As alcohol and drug treatment dollars go down, there could be less reunification.
- Foley: There are many variables, including access to treatment, that impact data.

ACTION: • **CWAC suggestions regarding measurements and outcomes may be sent to Pam Pearson.**

Face-to-face visits

- Foley: CWAC identified target percentages of where DHS should be with monthly face-to-face visits with children and with parents. The federal target is 90% of children in foster care by 2011. Congressional studies and CFSRs show that, nationally, children are not being seen by their caseworkers and states must improve. CWAC's target is to increase to 80% the percentage of face-to-face

visits with children over the next year. In September, we will be looking at the variations across counties. We now have a new worker-specific report that shows which visits must be done each month. Our policy requires visits every 30 days; however, new federal regulations require visits each calendar month. Therefore, we will need to count the visits by calendar month. They also require a majority of the visits take place in the child's residence. We do have the ability to track the data and will add location of visit. The child's residence can include the foster home (in or out of state) or residential placement. The federal review will also be looking at the quality and length of the visit. If the visits are done according to the needs of each child, some may need more frequent visits. The worker needs to be prepared to talk about the case plan and have a set of topics of substance to discuss. The federal review also requires that the worker have some private time with the child during the visit. These measures will be part of our federal review of cases in September.

- Hazelton: Asked about residential treatment and other exemptions that are currently allowed.
- Foley: We will be reconsidering the exemptions. The federal regulations will not allow 60 days between visits for children in residential treatment. As for permanent foster care, we need to determine if that is a qualifier that will allow a longer time between visits.
- Waller: Would want DHS to move in the direction of 30 days for all children. As teens move to adulthood, the visits are important to help plan the transition to independence. Looking at using CRBs more for permanent foster care cases. They do currently review those cases.
- Foley: Asked if CWAC would support a policy decision to require 30 day visits for permanent foster care.
- All: The consensus was CWAC would support such a policy decision.
- Foley: The feds tried to put a funding incentive behind the requirements to support caseworker recruitment and retention and the use of technology to support caseworkers. At the September CWAC meeting, we will provide face-to-face visit data by district and how far each one is from the target. We have asked for a window of amnesty if we change our policy to add permanent foster care to the 30 day visit requirement. We need to tell the feds by June 30 what our methodology will be. Then with their permission, we will set benchmarks for each year to get to 90% by 2011. With CWAC's goal of 80% in a year and the staffing POP, we should be in good shape to reach 90% by 2011.
- Hazelton: What measurements are in the "dashboard" and is it public knowledge?

- Foley: The Dashboard includes the most critical measurements in child welfare and self sufficiency (including face-to-face visits, how quickly CPS assessments are started and completed). We will share it with CWAC.
- Poppen: In his juvenile department, cases are assigned geographically which is more efficient for planning visits. Can child welfare also assign geographically?
- Foley: We do try to take that into consideration. There are also differences to consider when scheduling visits in rural and urban areas.
- Keeling: Residential treatment outside the child's home community makes it a challenge to make 30-day visits. Using a liaison worker does not meet the goal of having the child's own caseworker make the visit.
- Foley: Asked CWAC to send us other issues and questions about face-to-face visits. We will keep CWAC posted on our progress.
- Patton: Is there a way to include an assessment of the visit from children who are older?
- Waller: PSU has a model on how to involve youth in their decision making. It makes a difference to the youth when there are adults who were really listening to them. As the availability of facilitators for meetings is reduced, this model of youth involved in their planning meetings may be something to consider.
- George: A PSU survey to youth asked if the youth's worker saw them, if it was often enough and good enough. We are using some of the data from that survey in our CFSR.
- Foley: Will send CWAC information from a recent youth panel in Washington, D.C. One of their comments was how adoption of one child severs the relationship with siblings.

- ACTION:**
- **CWAC would support a policy decision requiring 30-day visits for permanent foster care cases.**
 - **DHS will provide data on face-to-face visits by district, including a comparison with the CWAC target (80%) and federal target (90%).**
 - **DHS will send the Dashboard to CWAC.**
 - **CWAC members are invited to send other issues and questions about face-to-face visits to Pam Pearson.**

Staffing POP

- Reinhart: Distributed a comparison between the original model and SEIU's proposal. Because we have limited funding, we have to find other ways to reduce the supervisor/worker ratio and caseload size. The SEIU model gets us

closer to national standards. In addition to this POP we have a process in place to gain staffing for work other than foster care. This drives us closer to the workload model we want to get to.

- Foley: Phase 1 of the workload study was outside CAF. Phase 2 looked at self sufficiency. Next up is child welfare. This POP is an interim step until the workload study is completed.
- Reinhart: The option we will be using abolished fewer positions than the original.
- Patton: Sees that the current staffing ratio for residential treatment cases is 1:40. The national standard is 1:15, as is the proposed ratio. Will DHS be able to get from 1:40 to 1:15 this year?
- Foley: Yes. Children in residential treatment have needs as important as children in foster care. Our responsibility does not go away when a child is in residential treatment.
- Patton: Agrees. They need to have a consistent relationship with a caseworker because it can make a difference in their success.
- Foley: While in treatment, a child's connection with family and community needs to continue. We are waiting to see where the POP ends up in the budget and are working with HR on implementation. Attrition from a current hiring freeze will help minimize the direct impact on workers. Overall, the CET positions convert to supervisors or case-carrying positions. We also are preserving the SSA work.
- Stiegler: Was part of the committee that developed the staffing model. It gets more staff doing direct casework.
- Foley: To get to these staffing ratios by only adding staff and not making any other changes would cost \$21 million. That was not an option, so we had to get creative. We are accommodating the staff in positions that will be converted from SSA to SSS1 by giving them a two-year window to get their bachelor degrees.

Guns in Foster Homes

- Foley: We have discovered that our regulations cannot tell foster parents how to handle their guns. We have to rescind the administrative rule. A legislator suggested a task force look at what the Legislative Assembly should do to address gun safety in foster homes. Advocacy for child safety is needed on the task force, so we are asking JRP to participate. The NRA will also be on the task force.

- Sherbo: Do police departments have regulations for what officers do with guns in their homes?
- Moore: No, his department talks with officers about gun safety, but we do not regulate.
- Sherbo: The issue is not about regulation, but child safety.
- Patton: The difference is a person's own children vs. the state's children.
- Sherbo: Oregon statute says only state law can regulate. Is there an existing state law that does so?
- Shugar: The Legislative Assembly has the authority to give the authority to regulate. It has not given that authority to DHS.
- Foley: Rep. Krummel said the Legislative Assembly would not feel comfortable giving blanket authority. Because it is too late this session to pass legislation, a task force will research the issue. Rep. Krummel and Barker may participate. DHS is not the only entity struggling with this issue. We are not sure what the agencies that regulate day care and nursing home care do. If any CWAC member wants to participate in the task force, let us know.
- Sherbo: Is it DHS' position that if a loaded gun is found in the reach of children, the foster home can be decertified because of this safety threat?
- Shugar: It could be used along with other evidence to show a lack of sound judgment.
- Patton: The child could then be removed if there was a safety threat to the child.
- Stetzer: The standards for the parent's home and foster home should be the same.
- Shugar: There is no disagreement; however, DHS cannot regulate it. DHS can assess the child's safety if access to guns comes to light, but the department cannot lay out expectations in advance.
- Foley: We can offer guidance, but not regulate. Asked if any members are willing to help with this issue.
- Stiegler: Offered to help.
- Foley: Would like someone from JRP.
- Sherbo: She will ask someone from the JRP staff to help.

ACTION: • **CWAC members interested in the task force are asked to contact Pam Pearson.**

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

- Legislative Subcommittee: Nothing to report.
- Teens Subcommittee: A new Teen Issues in Child Welfare Subcommittee is being formed. Letters of invitation will be sent this week. At the next Future Issues Work Group meeting, we will work on narrowing the focus of the subcommittee.

OTHER

- Foley: Gave an apology to CWAC for not being able to ask for input on the safety model and procedure manual while they were being developed. CWAC's input is valued and critical. Assured CWAC that responses to their questions about the model will be sent out on a timely basis and the committee will be involved in improving the model. She will schedule time with the Multnomah County Child Welfare Advisory Committee, is meeting with the judges soon, and will continue to meet with communities.

The next CWAC meeting is scheduled for September 12, 2007.

Meeting adjourned.