



FINAL

DHS Child Welfare Advisory Committee

Teens Subcommittee

April 12, 2006

Members

- Karen Andall
- Janet Arenz
- Mike Balter

- Leslie Currin
- Michael Kurtz
- Jean Lasater

- Shary Mason
- Julie McFarlane
- Mary Nathe

- Pam Patton
- Trish Reding
- Nan Waller

DHS Staff

- Mickey Serice
- Marita Baragli
- Bill Bouska

- Caroline Burnell
- Devon Burris
- Sue Faw

- Rosemary Iavenditti
- Dave Lyda
- Clayton Rees

- Elaine Wallick

Minutes prepared by Pam Pearson
Guest: Pamella Anderson

Subcommittee Minutes Approval

The February 8, 2006, minutes were approved with this change:

- Replace “commissioners” with “local commissions” in the **Survey** section.

Subcommittee Chair

- Serice: At the 2/8/06 meeting, Karen Andall suggested Michael Kurtz as subcommittee chair. During a later conversation, Michael explained to Mickey his need to decline. The CWAC chair appoints subcommittee chairs and has the authority to continue or discontinue subcommittees. Judy Stiegler would like to have a subcommittee member volunteer as a nominee. Explained the subcommittee chair’s duties to facilitate the group with Pam Pearson providing the prime coordination and planning for meetings.
- Pearson: Another subcommittee chair duty is to appoint subcommittee members.
- Serice: DHS staff are not excluded from serving as subcommittee chair; however, they are not voting CWAC members.
- Pam Patton, Trish Reding and Jean Lasater were suggested as nominees, but all declined.
- Serice: A decision is not needed today. Names can be sent to Judy Stiegler through Pam Pearson. The subcommittee has not had a chair in the past. Janet Arenz acted as facilitator during an early project and Mickey has taken that role more recently.
- McFarlane: Suggested Karen Andall, but was not willing to nominate her in her absence.

ACTION: Mickey Serice will talk to Karen Andall. If she is willing to serve as subcommittee chair, Mickey will forward her name to Judy Stiegler.

COMPILED SURVEY RESULTS

- Kurtz: During the 2/8/06 meeting, Michael offered to compile a crosswalk between the surveys of SDAs, juvenile departments and local commissions and to follow up where there were gaps. He completed the crosswalk, but was unable to do the follow up in time for today's meeting. The three surveys asked a similar initial question, but OYA went one step further (*italics for emphasis in these minutes only*):
 - < OCCF: Is there any multidisciplinary group (or groups) in your county that triages individual youths who are **not yet formally in the dependency or delinquency system** and attempts to connect them to the services they need (a youth service team would be an example of this type of service)?
 - < SDA: Do you have a multi-agency group that meets in your county (or counties) to discuss coordination of services or **specific teens who are not receiving services** from DHS/CW, DHS/MH, OYA or other local programs but who are **at risk of entering** either DHS or OYA (e.g., custody to the state)?
 - < OYA: Do you have one or more multi-agency meetings in your county for staffing cases of adolescents who are **at risk of, currently entering, or already involved** in one or more of the following systems? Child Welfare (DHS); Juvenile Justice (Juvenile Department, OYA); Mental Health (local or state provider); Alcohol and Drug (local or state provider).
- Reding: Did some follow up work since the last meeting and has missing information that can be added to the crosswalk. See handout, "Local Interagency Meetings Survey – Updated 4/11/06."
- Bouska: The original questions were not specifically about multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) or youth service teams (YSTs). We are interested in models that are working well.
- Kurtz: Will add Trish's information to the crosswalk. Also noted an error on the crosswalk document for SDA7 and will make that correction for the next version.

- Iavenditti: Clackamas did not respond, but she knows they have a process in place.
- Kurtz: Explained the column headings. The column titled YST shows which counties replied yes or no to the question about whether or not they had a group in place. It does not mean the group is a YST, but is simply used as an abbreviation. A question mark in that column means the survey response did not provide enough information to determine if it met the question we asked. The last column provides the descriptor.
- Serice: Before Michael continues to work on the crosswalk, we need to decide if we want to refine the information or take what we have and move forward. The general question was whether or not there were groups discussing teens. The answer seems to be yes, that counties have maintained this function. We had talked about developing a boilerplate interagency agreement and providing technical support.
- McFarlane: Would like to take one more step to integrate Michael's and Trish's materials into one document.
- Lasater: The Marion County information is not clear. It appears there are groups looking at teen issues, but no mechanism to triage youth not currently in any system. The Youth Consortium does not have a case management function.
- Serice: Trish's report addresses the triage. Also noted that we did not get full responses from all counties. Subcommittee members are aware of groups in some counties that are not listed in any survey responses.
- Patton: Youth Consortium is service integration, not triage. Don't assume that the triage is happening in the way it should be or that it is well integrated. We may need to look at our goal again. If we are going to prepare a model interagency agreement, we need a clearer picture of how individual counties are doing it. Our goal is to make it easier for counties, recognizing each county may have a different way. Marion County may be letting the juvenile department do it; others may have Youth Service Teams.
- McFarlane: We have discussed that there is no one way to do it, but we want to make sure it is getting done. We have talked about developing an agreement model that could be used at the local level and providing technical assistance to those that ask. She would like to hear how some counties triage and then decide how we could take that information to other counties. However, that would be a big task for us.
- Bouska: Our action plan describes what we want to accomplish and the steps toward getting there. It can help keep us focused.
- Serice: The action plan is draft. The subcommittee's report and recommendations did not receive a quorum vote by CWAC. He will talk to

Judy Stiegler about what happens when an email vote does not meet the quorum. However, this does not mean we can't look at the action plan for our next steps. Pam Patton makes a good point in asking what end product we want.

- Lasater: Access to services needs to be clear in any agreement. It needs to be designed to increase support to teens. We need to be clear that there are several levels of service integration.
- Serice: There is a fine balance in what DHS Central Office can tell local communities to do. That is one reason we wanted to see what currently exists. We can work to tie the homeless and runaway youth into these resources in other forums.
- Lasater: Her interest is to give communities a menu of options that is inclusive of teens not already in systems. We don't want to give communities only a list of who should be at the table, but ways to loop in the necessary players as needed when youth they would serve are discussed.
- Reding: Suggested having counties with models that are working well come to a Teens Subcommittee meeting, bringing their Memorandums of Understanding with them. This would help get their buy-in to our work.
- All agreed with Trish's suggestion.
- Mason: We never intended to replace what counties currently use with something we would create.
- Suggested counties: Polk, Clackamas, Jackson, and Deschutes.
- Serice: Videoconferencing is available for counties away from the Salem area.
- Kurtz: One question in the local commission survey asked about the effectiveness of the group. Wallowa County mentioned they were effective. Suggested including that county as an eastern Oregon representative. Also suggested Union County.

ACTION:

- < Polk, Clackamas, Deschutes, Jackson, Union and Wallowa counties were selected to be invited to share their information during the June 14, 2006, Teens Subcommittee meeting.
- < Responsibility for contacting each county:
 - Polk: Trish Reding
 - Clackamas: Rosemary Iavenditti
 - Deschutes: Jean Lasater
 - Jackson: Jean Lasater
 - Wallowa: Michael Kurtz
 - Union: Michael Kurtz

- < Pam Pearson will reserve DHS videoconference sites in or near each county listed.
 - < The counties will be asked to send people that are active participants in their group. They will also be asked to send their MOUs, interagency agreements and any other written materials to Pam Pearson in advance.
 - < The discussion will center on:
 - what works
 - the barriers
 - who is involved
 - the effectiveness of their MOU or IA
 - what they need to improve the process
 - how their process is inclusive of youth not formally involved in a system.
 - < After the telephone contact is made, a follow up letter will be sent that explains the videoconference process, the main items we wish to cover, and the materials we would like to receive in advance. We will also explain our work leading to this point and why they were selected to meet with the subcommittee.
 - < Counties will be free to invite as many of their players to attend as they choose.
 - < The June 14 meeting will be lengthened to three hours: 9:30 – 12:30.
 - < Each county will be interviewed separately, but the videoconferencing will be open for the full three hours so other counties can listen in.
 - < The survey crosswalk will be sent to the respondents so they can see the results.
- Patton: We will need a consistent definition of “multidisciplinary group.” We need to be clear in our purpose.

- Mason: Originally we were looking at groups discussing teens not formally in a system. Multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) would not be included unless they are used in a way beyond their official purpose.
- McFarlane: Smaller counties may be using MDTs in these ways, which would explain why they are identified in their survey responses.
- Mason: Wheeler County uses their MDT in this way. They could be invited to explain their process.
- Anderson: Suggested inviting other counties to observe and listen to the discussions on June 14.
- Serice: Agreed to that suggestion. There will be two communications sent: one to the invited counties and another to SDA managers to explain the purpose and give them the opportunity to invite interested partners to attend. He will need help from subcommittee members in contacting local commissions, OYA and juvenile departments regarding the opportunity to listen to the discussions.

ACTION:

- < Mickey Serice will draft an email to the SDA managers that subcommittee members will review and edit.
 - < Other subcommittee members will need to send similar messages to local commissions, OYA and juvenile departments.
 - < As the six counties confirm their participation, the subcommittee member making contact with them will notify Pam Pearson.
-
- Kurtz: In the crosswalk, the responses in the last column that seemed to fit what we were describing as groups addressing noninvolved youth are in bold italics.
 - Patton: Are we talking only about those youth not in a system? What are we trying to help counties do?
 - Lasater: It is not an either/or question. We want to ask if they have any accommodation in their process for noninvolved teens. We are specifically interested in youth not involved in systems and how the county incorporates them into their services for youth.
 - McFarlane: We also want to talk about youth in a system that would be more appropriately served elsewhere.
 - Patton: We are back to the goal in our action plan. We need to be clear about who we mean when we talk about teens in need of services. Are we looking for consistency in intake for youth coming in or already in systems?

- Iavenditti: In Clackamas County, they discuss available resources and the families are not present. It is inclusive of all systems. By looking at various models, we will get an idea of the best ones.
- Reding: If a county doesn't address youth not currently involved, we may be able to help them expand their current model.
- Patton: This will be a lot of work, so we want to make sure the information we get gives us what we want.
- McFarlane: We can focus on providing consistent intake for teens. That is not only for those not currently involved. We must acknowledge that there are teens being served that should be in another system and that some could be served less intrusively. Until we have consistent intake across the state, we can't restrict ourselves to teens that have not penetrated a system.
- Serice: Intake does not belong to only one agency.
- Wallick: Resources in some areas dictate the model. In some places, DHS is the only game in town.
- Reding: Should Mental Health be invited to listen in?
- Serice: Each county can choose who to invite. Also restated that we will have approximately three broad questions on which to focus the interviews.
- Lasater: We need latitude with broad questions, but the focus needs to be in finding answers on consistent practice.
- Serice: We are looking at their process and so we should not ask if youth are being served by the right system.
- Mason: That may come up when they describe their barriers and struggles.
- Kurtz: We are in a posture to listen and gather. We must not ask questions that lead to being critical of what the counties are doing.

INFORMATION EXCHANGE

ITEM 1

- Patton: During a meeting on 4/11/06 with OYA, a judge shared concerns that if a 17-year-old girl runs away from foster care, DHS is not going to look for her. Pam has concerns that there is still a public perception that DHS does not serve teens. The judge has discussed the specific case with Ramona Foley.
- McFarlane: Does not see a worse problem for girls than boys. Her experience is that DHS is doing better in serving older teens.
- Wallick: There is an AG opinion that determined DHS is not required to put warrants out for teens on the run from foster care. However, she believes that in general run reports are made. She offered to follow up to see if Multnomah County is making run reports.

- Patton: She shared this concern because it was mentioned in a public meeting by a judge.
- Serice: Because the SDA is aware of the particular situation and the judge discussed it with Ramona Foley, the Teens Subcommittee need not take action.
- Patton: She wanted feedback to know if others were hearing similar things.
- McFarlane: Youth that run from foster care are difficult to work with. The attitude she sees among DHS workers is less of giving up on them and more of appealing to them to try to get them back. DHS not serving teens is a past prejudice that has held in some communities.

ITEM 2

- Iavenditti: The ILP/TLP Pathways to Adulthood conference is scheduled for May 17-19, Doubletree Lloyd Center. She will send the registration website to the subcommittee.

ITEM 3

- Mason: Part of the Citizen Review Board's strategic plan is to increase teen participation in CRB reviews. If interested in this project, contact Shary at (503) 731-3339 or shary.k.mason@state.or.us.
- Patton: CRB is moving ahead on looking at gender specific services.
- Mason: This includes trans-gendered youth.

Meeting adjourned.