

**Idaho Child Welfare Partnership
Administrative Board Meeting Minutes
June 22, 2007
Casey Family Programs, Boise, ID**

Administrative Board Attendance: Michelle Britton, Division of Family and Community Services (FACS), Mardell Nelson, FACS, Mike Scholl, Casey Family Programs, Bill Clouser, Lewis Clark State College (LCSC), Butch Rodenhiser, Boise State University (BSU), Kathy Tidwell, BSU, Mike Frumkin, Eastern Washington University, Patty Gregory, EWU-Idaho Child Welfare Research and Training Center (ICWRTC), Chuck Halligan (attending for Kathleen Allyn, Division of Behavioral Health).

Guests: Sandy Cobb (note taker- EWU-ICWRTC) Rick Phillips, Research Director (EWU-ICWRTC), Brian Baldwin, FACS Management Analyst, Ken Perry, FACS Navigation Program Specialist.

Topic	Who	Discussion/Action
<p>9:00 am Coffee and Announcements</p>	<p>Michelle/All</p>	<p>Mike F. - Center Director search is under way with three viable candidates. Interviews to be held in July.</p> <p>Patty- Center Director hiring panel includes Mike S., Mardell, and Kathy, plus two faculty field directors. Also in the process of hiring data program coordinator, which so far is looking good. This position will take over responsibility of the Partnership website and development of a shared database.</p> <p>Michelle – Children and Family Services (CFS) is currently searching for and will be hiring a bureau chief who is a practice expert. Will work with programs and be involved in partnership. Anticipate a research element to the position. The Department has been involved in a CFS and children’s Mental Health (CMH) workload study - more on that later. The goal of the survey is to show how we manage our work. Will make position requests as a result of the study. Budget planning and recommendations through the Governors’ office.</p> <p>Chuck – Here representing Division of Behavioral Health for Kathleen Allyn. DBH will be hiring a bureau chief for Adult and Children’s Mental Health.</p> <p>Kathy –BSU has hired Academy Coordinator Michelle Wilson. She was formerly a child welfare program specialist for CFS. She is a social worker and Pride trained.</p> <p>Mardell – Brian has been working with American Humane on the workload study and will be reporting on it later in the agenda. We will use this information in Academy and Scholars program to be more</p>

	<p>Discussion on School Curricula and Focus</p>	<p>effective in developing career ladder for social work series. We will need to develop more incentives for master's level, such as using them for field supervision and mentoring new staff (as a retention strategy). This is part of CFS commitment to being a Learning organization. Will develop progression classifications and expect to have workforce input and help in this process.</p> <p>Mike F. – Due to the Council on Social Work Education accreditation standards, 95% of curriculum across programs the same but there are about 5% differences, which is where you find faculty and research interests expressed. At EWU, you will find a wide range of expertise across faculty and a major commitment to child welfare. EWU has 114 Washington stipend students who will work for DSHS. We have strong commitment to aging issues and crossover on intergenerational aging. Expertise in Substance Abuse outcome research and Universal Access (disability study center), which is bringing access across campus. There is a strong link to Native American community with two native faculty providing ICWA focus and support. The BSW program has a case management focus. This is driven by national data of what BSW students do in field. Took data set, replicated, doing similar study in Spokane. EWU has developed a suicide prevention curriculum/program online (also has native American version) for first responders and intervention options. Just about all practice areas are represented at EWU, with someone related research with interest. Students do agency based research projects.</p> <p>Bill – As Mike said all schools are very similar by definition by around 95%. LCSC has rigorous research requirements, with 12 credit hours dedicated to research project. We want our graduates to value research. You don't have to be a researcher to understand the value of data feedback. We require students to engage in field-based research relevant to practice. Bill observed that child welfare AFI (agency field instructor) participation has been disappointing in supporting student projects. LCSC offers undergraduate programs, where classes prepare for direct practice. We teach our students that while policies come from the top down, many of the best changes have been bottom up. We want them to understand that they can affect and influence policy. LCSC offers three primary minors: Psychology, Chemical Dependence, and Justice Studies.</p> <p>Butch – BSU is developing more child welfare direction, focusing on direct practice and social justice. We have done a lot of work with the homeless, addiction studies and we have an aging center. We are changing our organization and responding to community and student needs. BSU is part of a WICHE consortium with seven state university partners in a plan to address the shortage of social workers with expertise in rural mental health practice. We believe that we need to get more students involved in real research that has meaning.</p>
--	--	--

	Casey Research Focus	Mike S. –Peter Pecora is Casey’s Director of Research Department and he is on Faculty at University of Washington. They contract with universities and staff to provide research and use students to gather information and route data through Peter’s office. Casey is continuing to focus on reducing foster care disparate outcomes, alumni research, and foster children’s access to mental health. Certificate programs in mental health should include children’s mental health.
9:45 Disproportionality and Disparities for Children of Color in Child Welfare System	Presentation –	<p>Mike S. – Disporportionality and Disparities for Children in Child Welfare System: When asking white person about Idaho, the responses included “potatoes” & found that many confused Idaho with Iowa. When asking a person of color, the overwhelming response was “Aryan Nations”. This is a very white state and there is a different obligation for white people.</p> <p><i>Race Matters & Data Charts and Graphs</i> handed out (Attachments posted in Documents). Nationally - Children of color are 33% of the population, and 55% of foster population. This is a problem. African American children are 15% of the population, and 45% of the foster care population. Mike pointed out that this demonstrates “Overrepresentation” and quoted the <u>Race Matters</u> handout, “Maybe it’s a fine point, but studying disproportionality means examining relative reasons why each racial/ethnic group is more or less prone to be in the system. Studying overrepresentation means examining why only those groups who are overrepresented (possibly only African-Americans) are more prone to be in the system than is everyone else. Disproportionality is a potentially more useful term. It enables us to think more clearly and comprehensively about a complex issue and the research, policy, and practice strategies that could alter the situation for the betterment of all children.”</p> <p>Brian reviewed Idaho’s data and graphs. Race/Ethnicity data taken from census data and shows progress of children from system intake through foster care, and compares to overall population. Native Americans are 1.4% of population, but 8.8% in foster care (this includes only agency numbers).</p> <p>Discussed definition of overrepresentation and how they are represented. The data points to the following questions that need to be asked. What degree do you start be concerned? What fluctuations over time can be shown?</p> <p>Idaho appears to be better now than in 2000. Figures for African American 4.8% and Native American 5.4%. Some changes may be from better data collection in the FOCUS system. Idaho is the first state to show overrepresentation of Hispanic children. We have developmental work to do to teaching the data, reporting the data to support the definitions. Idaho has found that we too often collect data, but do not do anything with it.</p>

Work nationally --- The Administration of Children and Families (ACF) queries about high rates of children of color into system. Practice and systemic discussions are starting to occur around the country. . Mike referenced the “Intervention strategies to address disproportionality and outcomes” handout. The Partnership can go deeper, beyond each system’s contribution. If we want to approach a tribal system, we need to get the right tribal partnership at the table. Kalispell health system center works with Casey– Idaho needs to find interested partners. **Question:** Are we interested in forming IV-E partnerships with tribes in Idaho for education and workforce development? Can the IV-E stipend payback be to work in the tribal systems? These are questions best answered through an IV-E funding consultation. **Action:** Mike S has agreed to arrange Don Schmid to consult with the Department and with the Partnership.

Practice Interventions that seem to mitigate disparate outcomes for children of color include the following:

- Differential response
- Family find
- Family centered practice
- Family group decision making
- Kinship care
- Family preservation.

Next steps:

Mike F. - would also like to see substance abuse data incorporated. Michelle noted that the Department has historically not been good at collecting SA data.

Mike S – would like to see Social Work academic programs include disproportionality issues.

Butch – universities are in unique a position to grow relationships with tribes. This takes time and educational opportunities.

Bill- Idaho 14% in list of graduated high school, 49% in those who go on to college (all kids)

Action: Mike is taking lead to draft a disproportionality plan for the Partnership. The draft is to be complete by November meeting. We will need to provide clarity of language and data we use to discuss the issues and the interventions that need to be introduced in boards, agencies, etc.

Diversity Project -

Kathy - The Diversity Project is in the beginning stages at BSU Child Welfare Center. Kathy began in private practice working with refugees. It was through this work she became sensitized to language and access issues. The project proposal was written to respond to local need. We began with holding

		<p>community meetings with representatives of law, courts, hospitals, mental health, child welfare, and family practice on the use of interpreters. These groups have resources and access to interpreters and we are establishing a community database to find interpreter resources. A refuge student at BSU is doing his senior project at the Child Welfare Center. He is working with providers to share databases and is developing a joint database to facilitate shared information. Treasure Valley Interpreters Association (volunteer organization) will maintain the database, in the future. We are getting quality feedback about interpreters, as well. We are interested in working to expand the foster care pool by addressing ethnicity and language barriers, with targeted recruitment of foster parents to meet needs.</p> <p>Patty – The Spanish PRIDE session that was developed for Region 3, was delayed because the region did not have the language/culture infrastructure to support the subsequent assessment and licensing process. This project has implications and resources for assisting with targeted recruitment of staff and foster parents.</p>
<p>11:00 Operations Committee</p>	<p>Director's Report</p>	<p>Mardell - Handouts - <i>Updated Partnership Organization Chart and Operations Accomplishments Report</i> (Attachments posted in Documents). Reviewed the revised organization chart and operations processes to represent the structural changes adopted in February. The <u>Administrative Board membership</u> now includes the Dean of EWU School of Social Work, the Idaho Child Welfare Research and Training Center (ICWRTC) Director, a University Partner representative, FACS Administrator, FACS Deputy Administrator, FACS PET Manager/Partnership Director, Casey Family Programs Director (CFP), BSU School of Social Work Director, and BSU Child Welfare Center Director. The <u>Operations Committee of the Administrative Board</u> includes the ICWRTC Director, BSU CW Center Director, Casey Director and the Partnership Director.</p> <p>As part of the change in organizational restructure, Operations Committee members vacated leadership of the boards, which allowed for expansion in leadership. Elections for new chairs resulted in Brian Baldwin being selected for the Evaluation Board, Oscar Morgan for the Academy Board, and Ray Mullenax for the Scholars Board. They will serve 2-year terms. Kim Fordham, Resource Family Board and Julie Stevens, Practice Development Board, retain their Chair positions for one more year and will be up for election in May 2008, along with the University representative to the Admin Board.</p> <p>The Operations Committee of the Administrative Board meets monthly to direct Partnership Operations. Quarterly this group will meet jointly with the board Chairs. This combined group comprises the full <u>Operations Board</u>. This structure, not only expands the leadership within the Partnership, but also should enhance communication. .</p>

Rick logic model proposal rescheduled for the afternoon.

Accomplishments

Operations Board –

- Completion and rollout of website,
- two child welfare partner presentations were selected for the West Coast Trainers Conference in August (Patty and Heath Walters on Supervision, Mardell and Oscar on Workforce Development - Academy),
- Hiring committee established for new ICWRTC director,
- DBH joining the Partnership
- Chuck Halligan updated group on Jeff D lawsuit: direction is to provide more therapeutic foster care and to do a work group to study shortages in expertise. Responses to the Court included info from Partnership activity. Expect a final court decision this fall. Chuck expressed his appreciation for assistance from the universities and Mardell’s testimony about the Partnership. Development of a children’s mental health manual for academy sessions.

Evaluation Board - Brian /Patty:

- Foster Parent Exit interview study is underway. Michelle would like to share this information with the Legislature, J-FAC committee. It is not ready yet. We are starting to see trends.
- The RMOIC Project, including report by Diane Davis and the Motivational Interviewing Manual by Carla Dvoracek, is completed. The project tested a pre-treatment strategy to hold people in care. The project received federal award. Michelle would like to do a Headline news article. Products from this program will be published and shared.
- Academy Evaluation - Kathy and Rick explained the focus—tracking the competency development of child welfare staff and how we are preparing learners to increase competencies. Academy Evaluation is described in the State Comprehensive IV-E Plan: CQI loop to Academy evaluation and training. Results feed Scholars and Academy workforce development. Plan: share results with the Administrative Board.

Bill – Asked for clarification on what business process questions go to EWU and which to BSU? This resulted in discussion and referral to new organizational chart. Subcontracted university questions regarding budget and scope of work of subcontracts go to EWU. The Scholars Program is scheduled to be expanded this year to full time personnel and we can expect some role confusion during transitions. FFIs and Pride trainers form natural work groups, with which the respective boards work. Site visits are held twice a year providing a forum for contract negotiations and process clarifications.

		<p>Scholars Program – Academic curriculum concerns was expressed about the idea of finding equivalencies in Academy with the Scholars Program curricula. This should not be a problem as long as we focus on identifying outcomes, not the process.</p> <p>Distributed “<i>Scholars 2005-2006 Cumulative Outcomes Report</i>” (Attachments posted in Documents) Ray M. is responsible for this report including cumulative outcomes. The report includes financial data. Need to become savvier about strategically financing this partnership work.</p> <p>Action: Tabled remaining board updates, due to time constraints. Board members were asked to review handouts for updates on the remaining boards’ accomplishments. Partner website minutes are posted, so members can review the business discussed in each board.</p> <p>Mike S - Don Schmid did TA for Casey, which covered how child welfare is funded nationally and how to leverage funds.</p> <p>Action: The board Agreed to bring Don Schmid to Idaho to meet with Administrative Board to increase understanding of Title IV-E funding. Mardell and Mike will work with Don to schedule this in conjunction with a Partnership meeting. TA questions for Don to address include: Maximizing our existing budgets, claiming faculty time as match, sizing the student stipends available. Student placements tying back to IV-E eligibility and need for establishing candidacy, the refinancing strategy of expanding capacity by hiring needed personnel through the university. Need TA quickly for budget discussions that are going on now within the Department.</p>
<p>12:45 Logic Model Discussion</p>	<p>Rick/All</p>	<p>Rick presented the Operations Committee Proposal Handout – <i>Design Down, Deliver Up Collaboration Model (Draft)</i> (Attachments posted in Documents). Work boards have had difficulty setting forth what they will target and accomplish. In their work plans, they have generated 10 pages of tasks, which is too much to put minds around. There is conversation going in all directions. The logic model will help create a focus.</p> <p><u>Model Description</u> Level 1 – Administrative Board sets the mission and vision and determines goals.</p> <p>Some board members had difficulty seeing how boards are interconnected. (Example: Resource Family Board – Wondered how does it relate to work at the University? Answer: The Practice Development Board has education of youth as a very important outcome. The education focus of the Practice Board may result in strategies to improve access and success for youth transitioning from foster care into college.</p>

	<p>Next Steps</p>	<p>This would impact the Resource Family Board’s education of Resource Parents around their role in helping youth to transition to adult life (including college) and their role in linking with education systems around monitoring and supporting youth in school. The meaning education takes each board into similar directions with different perspectives and target audiences---one board is focused on client well-being outcomes, as while other boards are focused on recruitment and retention strategies for our staff and foster parent workforces to achieve the client outcomes.</p> <p>Level 2 - Operations Board set outcomes for work boards to meet Goal#1 and Goal #6. The Outcomes only are set; the group has not yet set the measures. Now that the Board has agreed to a disproportionality plan, another area of work for the Operations Board is to set goals and outcome measures for mitigating disparate outcomes for children of color.</p> <p>Level 3 – Reviewed sample Scholars Board activity plan. The boards receive and identify challenges and barriers: What is action going to address? Then prioritize: Which are doable? Which belong to us? Use evidence based strategies to address. Could be curriculum in academy, focus groups, mentoring, etc. How measures effectiveness of strategy? Workgroups measure their effectiveness in addressing challenges.</p> <p>We still need definitions for the logic model. Collaboration is not defined on this sheet. Mardell mentioned that the Partnership has used a collaboration framework each year at the Partners meeting to measure perceptions of movement toward collaboration. This model is familiar to many and might provide definition.</p> <p>Kathy – Having a vision from the Administrative Board is important to drive the work of the boards---as single plan with a common way of thinking that shows how each board can contribute to the partnership and prioritize work to be done. Visioning work at this level may be helpful.</p> <p>Action: Adopt by the Board and give direction to Operations Committee to operationalize this, set measurements, and pass down. Language may change during the measurement phase. What is needed to accomplish this will be fed back up. Rick will consult with each chair to move the process from Operations Committee to the boards. The Board Sanctioned the Operations Committee to Proceed.</p> <p>Mike F. – Suggested the Board hire a support person to be responsible for minutes and coordinating minutes and data sharing, develop partnership presentation materials, following up with boards to get notifications out, keep people engaged. He suggested this could be funded through IV-E. EWU offered to hire the position and located the person in Boise, reporting to Mardell.</p>
--	--------------------------	---

		<p>Action: The board was in consensus to have EWU hire administrative support person for Partnership Director to support the Administrative Board and Operation Committee.</p> <p>Mike F. – Suggested rewards for boards who achieve their objectives. Need a process to recognize accomplishments. Perhaps, the annual meeting is a nice place to celebrate. The logic model will help track achievement on boards.</p> <p>Chuck and Rick - CMH did a logic model exercise recently with a group identified by ICCMH. It was a very complex process. The field did not feel that it was a helpful process. The level of understanding did not match the difficulty of the document; however leadership views this as a directive tool.</p>
<p>2:00 Child Welfare/Children’s Mental Health Workload Study</p>	<p>Brian /All</p>	<p>Workload Study – Brian handed out “Idaho Workload Analysis Survey and Staff Allocation Model, the final report from American Humane Association and discussed the findings of the workload study. Report provided empirical justification for more staff: Conclusions – CFS needs 74.5 social workers, different levels of need for different regions, differences by case characteristics. CMH also has specific needs for 15.9 staff.</p> <p>Brian- There was high staff participation.</p> <p>Rick’s feedback--- the report had some validity issues. It does not tell what we did not have time to do. Need to wonder what was not captured?</p> <p>Michelle – The report only says we need more bodies. The report made it clear that it is not how we allocate resources; there are not enough of them. Staff moral will suffer if they get no response, and next time we will not have good level of participation. We will need to get resources from outside FTE system if FTE resources are not forthcoming. We will want to leverage IV-E dollars. We need to manage within the current environment. Contracting is another way to provide relief to staff.</p> <p>Also, Patty noted the more agencies we contract with, the more places there are to put students. The Evaluation Board is expected to submit feedback on the study on June 25.</p>

<p>2:45 Navigation Presentation – Kinship Project with Casey</p>	<p>Ken /All</p>	<p>Ken Perry, Program Specialist Supervisor of DHW Navigators reported on a joint Kinship Project with Casey Family Program.</p> <p><u>Navigation Services Overview</u></p> <p>Across the state, there are 24 Navigators located in Idaho’s seven regions. Distribution is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 4 in Region I ▪ 3 in Region II ▪ 4 in Region III ▪ 4 in Region IV ▪ 3 in Region V ▪ 3 in Region VI ▪ 3 in Region VII <p>They are disbursed geographically to meet needs of persons in their local communities, thus they do a lot of rural outreach. The program is experiencing a rarity---3 vacancies (for normal reasons). Navigation would like assistance from the Partnership on placement of students.</p> <p>Currently the program is gathering information on resources to serve better kin care providers. Kin care is one of the target populations that IDHW is interested in serving better, than in the past. Self-reliance has been the usual point of contact for kin care providers who need help. Navigators help families navigate through the formal system and the community to access what they need. The program is starting to see larger numbers of relative providers coming in for services. Some kin providers just need a support or grandparent group. Some are seeking legal help for guardianship and mental health services for the children in their care. Navigation is the only access point within the Department to Emergency Assistance funds and the route for access to Casey Kinship funds. Casey is scheduled to make another distribution of funds through Navigation in July 2007.</p> <p>The relative care movement has caught fire. Coalitions are forming and there are advocates from many systems associated with IDHW. When empowered, kin providers start to be a powerful constituency. This is good thing. This is our second line of defense to child welfare. Some say we have neglected this population for years. We need to continue to develop and support this resource. The local Eagles Lodge has chosen relative care as their fund-raising project. Navigators will be distributors of the funds from this effort.</p> <p>Region 1 is exploring the idea of navigators being a first point of contact for SR (self-reliance) applications. This would create business efficiency, since most navigators have been SR workers. This</p>
---	------------------------	--

		<p>would also prevent people needing help from being bounced around in the system. Navigators provide immediate customer service and are providing services for many who do not meet the criteria for regular DHW services. One key challenge is getting families to engage.</p> <p>Ken - Navigators do ecomap assessment and planning to resolve crises. Navigators have become a hub for community services, helping engage families and community non-profits. Navigation gets money to families in crisis. Their ability to leverage funding is huge. Private groups are stepping up because the infrastructure is in place with no administrative overhead. Navigation is also linked to and overseeing the Community Resources for Families Program. This program has historical experience with civic groups and community services.</p> <p>There is a need to manage to capacity, since this is a limited resource. As the program becomes more well known, there will be communities that want/need more navigators.</p> <p>Patty – Asked about the need for student placements? Navigation takes a strengths-based, family centered approach to preventing and diverting families from child welfare. This type of placement would be a great learning opportunity for students. Navigation will not qualify for IV-E stipend support, unless the system develops the means of serving IV-E Candidates. Establishing candidacy may be the way to be able to develop paid undergraduate field placements in Navigation. Ken suggested not ruling out Navigation as an MSW placement. It is very rich community development and organization placement option</p> <p>Mardell - How would Navigation provide MSW level supervision for qualifiable learning environment? Ken and the other Program Specialist, Scott Burlingame provides Clinical Supervision to all the Navigation Units. They would be able to provide academic supervision. Navigation may also be a good placement opportunity for student units.</p> <p>Action: Explore the process of IV-E Candidacy during the funding consultation with Don Schmid.</p>
<p>3:30 Presentation on Web Site</p>	<p>Sandy/All</p>	<p>The website is ready for public access; however, we also need continued input to improve the site content. Board members were asked to review and provide feedback. Please route comments to Sandy. BSU is now using the site to post Academy and other training. Discussed publicizing the site. We can post information about the site on child welfare (IV-E) list service and announce through each agency PR process.</p> <p>Action: Discussed getting a DHW Headline News article and providing a link to the website. www.icwpartnership.org. Sandy will add a CMH tab to the home page.</p>

<p>4:30 General Discussion regarding the Partnership</p>	<p>Mardell/All</p>	<p>Provided clarification that the next election is May 2008. This would be to elect Chairs of the Resource Family Board, the Practice Development Boards and the University Partner representative to the Administrative Board. At this same time, the DHW Co-Chair on the Administrative Board would rotate out and a new Co-Chair (EWU) would rotate in, to serve with the Casey Director.</p> <p>August 1 is next Operation Committee meeting. Rick asked board members to get back to him with feedback on the logic model within the next week.</p> <p>The next Administrative Board meeting will be a single agenda meeting--- the funding consultation with Don Schmid. The time and place are to be negotiated and will ideally occur in August/September of 2007.</p>
<p>Next Meeting</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>Next meeting: Joint Administration/Operations Meeting is scheduled for November 13th and the All Partners meeting is on November 14th. Save the date cards, regarding time and place of the All Partners meeting have been distributed.</p>