

ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Date: November 20th, 2008 Time: 8:30-4:30 pm (MT)

Location: Casey Family Services, 6441 W. Emerald St., Boise, ID 83704

Attendance: Michelle Britton, Mike Scholl, Lynne Morris, Roxanne Printz, Kurt Lyles, Butch Rodenhiser, Kathy Tidwell, Mardell Nelson

Guests: Robert Hernandez (Notes)

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
Agenda and Minutes Review	<p>The agenda was reviewed.</p> <p>The July 2008 Minutes were accepted</p>		
<p>Announcements/ Updates From Partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint EWU/BSU Contract Monitoring • PIP Update • Child Welfare Conference Follow-up 	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>UNIVERSITY VISIT REPORT</u></p> <p>University Visit. The University Centers Team (Kathy Tidwell, Ray Mullenax, Roxanne Printz and Kim Fordham) were visiting partnering universities in Regions 1 and 2. They first met with Deans and Directors to reintroduce them to the Partnership and rejoined with the Program Managers to see where they are in relation to the universities. The discussions with the Deans, Directors and DHW Program Managers were around grounding. The meetings first focused on the reason we all are here (care for children, families and students) and the Team wanted to amplify how much the Partnership shares the same concern. Other discussion areas included asking how can the Partnership support the work the universities are doing and having their stakeholder involvement by having the right people at table. There was also the discussion on roles and responsibilities, not who does what, but if there is a commitment to the big picture.</p> <p>University Interest. There was interest in the Partnership so the Partnership structure was explained to them. There were questions about funding and how this works. The Program Managers provided input and process information. The universities shared how they can help DHW and DHW shared how they can help the universities. Everyone saw how there is something for them in this Partnership. The community schools want to make an impact on the local level. This is a nice foundation for the RIP and the universities understood that they are there to help the DHW RIP.</p>		

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
	<p>University Result. The meetings were fun and very exciting. This was an area of frustration before, but it was good to visit the contract schools. It was also great that BSU and EWU came together. Conversations have not been done before and so everyone realized how much we can help each other. It really was a mutual exchange across the Partnership. The meeting was very positive and the team left with the university partners wanting to know how we can keep this going. They want to keep the momentum going. A take-away is that the universities and EWU/BSU are coming together as a partnership. Connections automatically began to happen.</p> <p>University Representation. Bill Clouser was the university representative but his term ended in the Spring 2008. When the universities were asked to vote for another Partnership Representative, they indicated that they did not want a single representative for all universities, but a representative from each university representing his/her own university. They can represent their school well and are waiting to see where the Partnership currently is.</p> <p>University Future Visit. The University Centers Team plans to visit Region 3 tomorrow, November 21st, 2008.</p> <p><u>PIP REPORT</u></p> <p>PIP Strategy. PIP draft handouts were distributed to the board members. The strategy is to have the PIP as minimal as possible and look at what DHW really wants to keep track of for the next two years. It is looking at what tasks are being done that need improvement without doing more new things to them. The PIP has nothing much that is new; it is expanding and doing more of what DHW has been doing. DHW is obligated to report to the Feds quarterly. It was commented that it would have been good to see the Partnership mentioned in the PIP. The reason for the limits on what was stated is because DHW is trying to be as minimal as possible in reporting how the PIP is done.</p> <p>PIP Review. The handout was reviewed with an emphasis of each listed goal. The primary strategies are: Maintain Children Safely in Their Own Home, Engaging Families, Improving Child/Youth Stability in Foster Care and Enhancing Child Permanency. The Action Steps of each strategy was also reviewed. Some areas discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family Group Decision Making (FGDM) seen as methodology that helps identify relatives, family input in case planning and information gathering. 		<p>The University Centers Team plans to visit Region 3 tomorrow, November 21st, 2008.</p>

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop resource training that clarifies roles and the foster parent role. They have not been used effectively as partners, especially in area of court. • In permanency it was commented this is big and that there is confusion in family-centered practice and that reunification is family centered. Workers need to see permanency as a goal and reunification as family practice. Workers say it is hard to make that decision and do a full family disclosure. Work will be done to look at concurrent planning as a strategy. • There are various legal services issues so the strategy is a statewide survey for staff to give input on legal issues and decide who will be doing what. There are planned visits and training with prosecutors to orient them in family services. • Process mapping for adoption and working to simplify some of the adoption work. This includes changing the form and putting it in a different context from adoption or termination. This implies that DHW is really using contract dollars during budget cuts, especially since reunification is the focus. There is a challenge on how contract money will be used since the cuts have been made. • The Program Managers are not grounded in family-centered practice so there is not a unified view of this. Idaho can claim a practice model that makes sense, is official and can anchor this as a practice model with a methodology that enhances family-centered practice. • What is the decision for permanency if there are three of four siblings chosen for adoption? There needs to be a stronger clinical perspective on how to make this type of decision since there are many dimensions to it. Need more clinical knowledge and the universities can help with this. They can build a strength-based family-centered clinical curriculum. In doing this, they are to keep in mind that the state requirement for MSW does not include clinical and they cannot use the term “clinical” and fund the course with IV-E. Having embedded trainers can get the clinical support without issuing clinical licenses. • What are things we know that are family-centered that leads to permanency? It is visits by parents, but work needs to be done on this. Some parts of state are doing once a week visits. Do we need a contractor to make this more frequent? • Having meetings with the social work faculty to plot a course that will make the work seamless for the workforce in Idaho. There needs to be conversations on what we have and be careful around the word “clinical.” <p>PIP Dates. The PIP is due to the Feds for final approval by December 4th, 2008 and will roll out to the regions for their RIPs starting in Jan/Feb 2009. On December 9th and 10th, 2008 Division Ops will be meeting and discussing concurrent planning.</p>		

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
	<p>Contracts will also be reviewed and prioritized at these meetings.</p> <p>PIP Partnership. There are various areas where the Partnership can help with the PIP. The Partnership boards and universities can help with key areas of the PIP. The role of the Admin Board is to set the direction on where the Partnership is going, put together an annual plan and then filter that plan to the boards.</p> <p><u>CHILD WELFARE CONFERENCE FOLLOW-UP</u></p> <p>Feedback. Overall the feedback was positive. Anything with kids and families was well-received and the social workers saw that this is what it is all about.</p> <p>Focus Groups. The conference focus groups provided a plethora of data to analyze and integrate into the practice. The Academy Board spearheaded the focus groups project. A grad student is now categorizing the retention data to present this at the December 2008 Division Ops Meeting. A more detail process will be done with select expert groups in order to capture the data so this can be seen in detail and parallels what the staff is seeing. Recruitment responses will be analyzed by the Scholars Board, retention responses will be analyzed by the Academy Board and disproportionality responses will be analyzed by the Practice Development Board. This data can then be posted on the Partnership website so the staff can see what is happening with they said.</p> <p>Financing. The way the conference was financed has presented a dilemma and some regions are having an operating challenge.</p> <p>Next Conference Plans. The committee is making preparations for the next annual conference and the following are areas discussed in the planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding is a challenge. This will be worked and pre-planned to have IV-E match the cost. • They are looking at how to structure it. It cannot be back to back since no one was at the office when people were leaving and arriving to the conference at the same time. • Another discussion item is consideration in doing this as hub rather than centrally. This can match the RIP as each region may have its own need. A conference that is hub-based would be supportive of the RIP. If this is done, then there can be a statewide conference every few years. • How the presenter can meet the attendees' needs. 		

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the committee can communicate the level of each workshop, this will be done. 		
<p>Budget Picture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FACS Budget; Review of Financial Charts Handout- Michelle 	<p>Financial Situation. The following were areas of discussion concerning the current budget cuts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently Idaho has a 2.5% holdback. With these cuts, DHW will have to deal with vacancies without overworking the workforce. The understanding is that SFY10 will be worse with no new funding. There will be major changes in Medicaid and reduction of PSR from twenty to ten hours. If the legislature says no to the time reduction, then there will be lay-offs. Even called to close ISSH and if this is done others cannot take them in. Food stamps have increased in 2008 and will increase even more in 2009. Need to anticipate that the numbers will not look good in a year. There may be another 5% cut and BSU is preparing for this. They have already taken hits in operating costs. Washington is prepared for a 5% cut and projects 5%, 10%, 15%, and 20% cuts. These cuts will have to be from universities and prisons. The EWU Director is determined to protect child welfare as much as possible. Casey's endowment has also been substantially hit and so the budget cut in 2009 for operating was reduced by three million dollars. By 2010 there may be up to a twenty million dollar reduction in operating costs. They are still fully committed to child family services and are not planning to cut this. The Casey office in Idaho is funded by they child family services division and hopefully will not be affected. Forty thousand dollars is still dedicated to the Partnership from Casey- twenty thousand of this goes to the conferences. One Decision Unit that may still be possible is the one involving the chiefs, so long as TANF does not have to be reduced. As long as TANF holds DHW can get \$250k from Idaho's General Fund. Use of the curriculum analysis for increasing IV-E is being worked on so we can know how much IV-E we can draw from the Feds before the Idaho legislation meets. If the Academy is refinanced based on the curriculum analysis, the IV-E becomes the source of funds for the chiefs. As long as this can happen, the chief's project has not been pulled from the list. <p>Billing Charts. A review of billing charts was done. The following were some of the observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The charts reflected how much Children's Mental Health (CMH) is funding the programs and the potential cost that will affect FACS should they make a 		

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
	<p>decision to pull away. They can engage the schools in a separate relationship for IV-E if they don't get funded by Medicaid.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Scholars Program has had a significant drop in TANF, from \$253K in SFY07 to nothing in SFY08. • The Academy and Resource Family are still too high in TANF funding and will be affected when TANF is reduced. Need to increase the IV-E funding for these. • It was suggest having a pie chart illustrating how each external partner contribution generates IV-E. 		
<p>Follow-up to Don Schmid Consult:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of Decision Units • Partnership Sustainability Challenges and Opportunities - Michelle 	<p>IV-E Report Status. The Partnership is still waiting for Don Schmid's IV-E Report. This was expected on November 1st, 2008. He was contacted on the status, but was on his way to Egypt when contacted and will return November 24th, 2008. The report was not yet done. The plan is to use his report to make some financial decisions. It was decided to have a conference call after Don Schmid's report arrives.</p>	<p>Have an Admin Board conference call after Don Schmid's report arrives.</p>	
<p>Operations Board Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board Accomplishments Reports • Partnership Challenges • Proposal for Facilitated TA/Strategic Planning - Mardell 	<p><u>BOARD REPORTS</u> Scholars Board. A report of the Scholars Board was given with the following highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board is currently working on their logic model and on outcomes. This will look different after their December 2nd, 2008 meeting. • They completed the Student Manual and it is now online. • The Student Institute is being planned. • For the universities, the FFIs have done a Disproportionality Plan promoting ways that each university can recruit students for the workforce. • The Diversity Plan is now in the reports and they are preparing the cover letter. • The board is working with the tribes and the outcome is Christelle Edmo joining the board. • Ken Perry will take over the contract monitoring for the Scholars Program. He has a relationship with the FFIs. Ken has taught at BSU, was the director of Casey and wanted students to have good placement. He understands DHW, the University and Casey. He is also looking at clinical supervision. • The board's challenges are process related and have to do with cross systems work. Knowing who has what role and how to collaborate is a challenge they are working on. Progress is being made on how the various boards are to interact 		

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
	<p>with each other.</p> <p>Family Resource Board. A report of the Family Resource Board was given with the following highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board is doing a lot of planning work around the statewide recruitment plan. What is being seen as a national trend is one-on-one recruitment. However, in tracking how recruitment is currently being done, we are doing the opposite. So the board is working on putting resources where should go for recruitment. • The Recruitment Peer Mentors (RPM) had their first chair meeting. • North Idaho College (NIC) has produced a video on what PRIDE is all about. A preview will soon be seen. • There will be a statewide foster parent conference at Boise in May 2009. The conference theme is Partner-Ship. • They have had a challenge with the Spanish PRIDE rollout. The last Spanish PRIDE was completed and it was up to regions to hire the resource families, yet six months later the homes were still not licensed. Most of the licensing delays were in Regions 3 and 4 and the managers know about this. They don't want to start another Spanish PRIDE until this gets worked out. • There is also a need for data collection and working with the Evaluation Board on how the boards are to intersect. <p>Practice Development Board. A report of the Practice Development Board was given with the following highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is new membership in the board. • In Region 4 there is an IROC with a nice model for network based collaboration. • They have focused on the Disproportionality Plan for both the Partnership and the state of Idaho and are looking at how to anchor and support the rollout of this. • The board has divided into two work groups. One will focus on the Disproportionality Plan and the other group will focus on constituency engagement. • Other boards have submitted their disproportionality logic model to the practice board. • An FCAA Chapter with national connections is starting in Idaho and will be voice of foster care alumni. This connects with the board's plan to have speaker's bureau and the interest is having this integrated in training and advocacy. There is training on this in the PIP which shows a commitment of youth voice in court. There are resources to do this activity, but there is still a disconnection. The foster 		

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
	<p>care youth want to have a voice. This group is a resource and has requested to come to this body where they can educate the court in CIP and what needs to be done.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work is being done with the KinCare Coalition and an application is in process to have a VISTA volunteer work with Casey to emulate what is happening in Region 7, which is a network based collaborative. They are trying to resource the scope of kin-care work. These are all around the state- constituents who have been mobilized to help the system be family-centered. <p>Academy Board. A report of the Academy Board was given with the following highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marie Seegler and Stacie Golden have been added to the board. Their continuing status depends on CMH. • The focus group talked about data analysis around the three goals and having the training posted to the KLC. • The website launched for the diversity project interpreters is going well. 211 may continue hosting this website. Region 4 is using this as a resource. There are no deaf interpreters on the list yet, but they do have their own resources. • A current challenge is that the class size is so large. This includes ten people from Region 1, which is having high turnover. The result that this is draining more funds due to the larger class size. Retirement has been a factor in affecting turnover. <p>Evaluation Board. A report of the Evaluation Board was given with the following highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In looking at how to best assist the other boards a work committee was formed to look at their charter and purpose. • There is an issue around how to think about evaluation and research (there was discussion on participatory evaluation). • They are making sure not to push the framework on the other boards. • DHW wants research so anything that is evaluation will fall on Evaluation Board since DHW won't address evaluation in the IRB. <p>Operations Board. A report of the Operations Board was given with the following highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The convening of the Don Schmid Consultation. • They are working on board alignment with the PIP • Preparing for the annual meeting and awaiting the Admin Board's decision on having an annual meeting. 		

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Operations Board has been the place where parallel discussions have gone on and they charged Mardell to draft a revision of the MOU and provide a definitions section based on Webster and prior MOU definitions. This first draft will be for the Admin Board to review and provide direction. • They are having struggle with clarity of vision and coming across barriers in cross organizational work. They are seeking clarity with the challenges. • Recommendations for technical assistance were made by the Operations Committee. They want this technical assistance to be given by the National Resource Center. They may be able to have a day of technical assistance for planning, operating and partnership development. • They have assessed that the Partnership is at a storming stage of in its developmental process. • A note to all board chairs was given as a model which included stages, charters and being self-directed. • They noted that more time and energy needs to be spent at the Admin level to ease things up with other boards. This would include providing a feedback loop to the board's challenges at regular Admin Board meetings. A suggestion was to meet every other month for half a day rather than all day per quarter. Video technology can be used for these meetings. The more frequent meetings would keep clear what needs to get done from meeting to meeting. <p><u>PARTNERSHIP CHALLENGES</u></p> <p>Partnership's Direction. The question on Partnership direction was brought up. Is the Partnership a collaborative entity to advance social policy for children and families in Idaho or is it an extension of DHW, helping the public child welfare system? If they open up all systems, including constituencies, then this is a more global direction for the Partnership. The Partnership's structure includes constituency engagement in child welfare and this is a struggle since DHW's work on the PIP does not involve constituency engagement. It was mentioned that the desire is to minimize the PIP and not have it as the driver for DHW. It was brought up that the Partnership was conceived as a support for the child welfare system in Idaho but developed strategies which included constituents. Casey, as a member of the Partnership, has a vested interested is child welfare and systems improvements in Idaho.</p> <p>Partnership's Contracts. Currently the Partnership is in service to DHW around a IV-E Partnership. The contracts have determined who gets funded and so the current Partnership is primarily around contracts. With this being a contractual relationship</p>		

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
	<p>for doing DHW work, it is not a true partnership. The challenge has been joining the four entities to a degree that transcends contractual relationships.</p> <p>Partnership Beyond IV-E. Lynne shared a recent conference visit she made. She indicated a version of this happening in the country, i.e., where to focus in order to have an impact on the child welfare system. Idaho is a more community-based state. Other states have expanded their focus on who they want to bring at the table beyond IV-E participants in order to bring system change. The focus is dual, involving both IV-E and private sector philanthropic entities who want to be involved in system change. One state was able to get 10 million dollars in funding this way. Do we want to only work from within or from where the decisions are made that can impact the process and provide resources?</p> <p>Partnership Vision, Role, Policy. It was indicated that a letter was going around about the Partnership stating that the partners are in it to serve DHW and they would not exist if they were not in the Partnership. There was disagreement with this letter. The legislative power resides with DHW. There are human resource and political issues as personnel change. The challenge is how to work together as a group. BSU hasn't felt it has been in the political flow of the Partnership for the past three years and wants to get past this. The Partnership Admin Board needs to decide on its vision, role, policy, and meeting frequency. There needs to be a structure on how to make decisions, when to have shared governance and when make individual partner decision.</p> <p>Partnership Director. It was indicated that Mardell's PET position will be filled, but a Partnership Director separate from DHW would depend on where the Partnership is going. This includes considering what financial picture will look like in the next few years. It was commented that it is tenuous that Mardell will not be the Partnership Director. The Contract Monitors are now dispersed. They are not connected to who runs the Partnership and are external to the Partnership Director. These two positions have to remain separated. The financial situation is currently unclear in order to hire a Partnership Director. More will be known when Don Schmid's report arrives. The thought was whether there were other models to look at for funding a director. Since Casey has to be involved with the public sector for IV-E, Casey may be creative with the funding to finance this position.</p> <p>The consensus is that there needs to be a Partnership Director. During the interim Mardell's</p>		

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
	<p>PET replacement will be reporting on contracts and working with Partnership.</p> <p>Partnership Director Triangulation. Mardell was asked if she would be interested in the Partnership Director’s position if funds can be generated to hire a director. Her response was that it depends. This is work that she has wanted to do and has proposed for five years. She shared that when Ken Diebert decided to merge the two positions (Contract Monitor/Partnership Director), what already existed was in contracts. The director assignment is something she always loved to do; however, the reality is that contract monitoring was already a full time job. This has now become two jobs and it is not manageable to do both to the degree that both need to be done. Having it start this way was natural in the Partnership’s formative stage since it was predefined by contract and the PIP. But now the Partnership is at a new developmental stage- having a more global social policy. The Operations and other boards became self-directed, as charged by the Admin Board, and took the Partnership to a bigger framework. This created triangulation. There were eight contracts that were written which detailed the responsibility to do the work a specific way. This was in conflict with what the Partnership Director is to do which lead to areas that were less clear: e.g., branding, external communication, whose money is it, and how to make personnel decisions. This has lead to tensions. One cannot manage the workload, with the conflicting type of work this is, and still move the Partnership forward. This tension has resulted in repetitive and courageous conversations (conflicts with love and a bigger hope in mind). The Partnership cannot move forward in this current scenario of having the Partnership Director also be the DHW Contract Monitor. By leaving the positions, this will challenge DHW to look at the contracts and move it to others. This will show that the Partnership Director does not need to be the DHW Contract Monitor.</p> <p>It was asked to clarify triangulation and what is the point of triangulation? The point of triangulation is the role of contract monitor and the role of a director of a collaborative partnership. These go in different directions.</p> <p>Partnership Safety. It was brought up that this triangulation has affected others. We need to create some safety in Partnership and boards to have the needed conversations and provide time in the agenda to have these conversations. When they don’t happen at the Admin Board level it happens at the other levels, but decisions cannot be made. When the Admin Board fails to make a decision, everything else is stuck. There needs to be a safe environment without any partner making decision for other partners. Right answers will come collectively when safety is established.</p>		

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
	<p>Partnership Research or Evaluation. There was conversation on participatory evaluation vs. research. This feels like a disrespectful conversation as it is not valuing all the partners. Everyone shares the same vision, but the methods are different. The Admin Board has to have the conversation if it is one, the other or both. This issue was at the Evaluation Board meeting. The decision for Participatory Evaluation began before the Partnership began. This was in service to child welfare. If it is participatory, then the family or stakeholders have a part in the process at every point. This has been going on since Roseanne was the Director. There was a contract with evaluator attached to it indicating what DHW wants to do with the data. The project at the BSU CWC with the focus group has a false dichotomy since this compromises the ability for knowledge based practice. It was mentioned that we can have participatory research and open the issue to what are the questions we need to ask to get the answers we need; otherwise we limit ourselves. Participatory research can help DHW. This conversation has been going on for at least eight years and is now at a developmental point where it may need to change. EWU is supporting DHW in research and BSU is interested. What is done by contract determines this. It was stressed that we need to trust each other enough to know that BSU will not do something in service only for itself but in service to the Partnership's mission.</p> <p>Partnership Structure. A brainstorming session took place on how to restructure the Partnership and the boards. There were ideas on how to do this which included a sample Partnership organizational structure. It was suggested reformulating the Partnership with a broader vision and having DHW work with current boards and the Partnership Director with this vision.</p> <p><u>PARTNER DESIRE/NEEDS</u> BSU: Butch and Kathy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The School of Social Work has three missions: 1.) See that the school meets the needs of children and families in Idaho; 2.) Carry out the responsibility of providing quality education, which means having a great Scholars Program; 3.) See that the faculty has publishable research and be very participatory in doing this. • Personally (Butch). Be a leader, do what is good and help children and families, have colleagues (friends and relationships) and make the Partnership work. • Politically. 1.) Advance the role of BSU in the state. The school president wants BSU to be a metropolitan school; 2.) Money- get more and have more. 		

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes, flexibility and the support to get there in child welfare work. • Be problem solving in creative ways and have flexibility to do this. Also the field of study at large. • Shining light in areas of diversity and having access to services for diverse groups. <p>EWU- Lynne and Roxanne.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as BSU with difference in area of research. There is a need for tenure and research. Having research that meets the needs of the faculty so that also produces system changes and longer term, broader based impacts on social policy. • Strengthen expertise in social work and knowledge for practice in rural social work. • Interest level in student research. They had a model that placed emphasis on student research but this will go due to cuts. This is a low priority as a small class activity. • Set a research agenda that is child welfare based. Focus on what it means to graduate MSW who are committed to evidence-based practice as a process and understand vehicles for what's the best practice. • How to bring other universities to the table. Where is the table to have this if not at the Partnership's table? • Understanding where the Research Training Center is in relation with EWU. • What the university brings is time and perspective of evidence-based practice. So having the system work on changing thinking, prioritizing interest based on past practice and aligning practice and thinking. <p>CASEY- Mike</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth and families- Reducing the number of youth in foster care and reinvesting the dollars saved. • Methodologies that will mitigate disparate outcomes. • Holding systems accountable around how we are committed to the Partnership's areas of focus. Have plans from each organization showing how committed they are to the Partnership and infiltrate this throughout the system. <p>DHW- Mardell and Michelle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruit and retain a stable workforce including foster care. • Build a child welfare system of care, meaning community practice. • Have an open system and define child protection as a community problem and engage stakeholders in this, which means having a family-centered practice. • For outcomes focus on the most vulnerable children in the system which would improve the whole system. 		

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be a leader for system change in the community. • Have a stable and inspired workforce to help staff do their job, see the importance of it and love it. • Meet the Feds' improved outcomes for funding, staff and political satisfaction. • Collectively improve the ability to manage the workforce. • Having access to the field and input from the field with a less cumbersome process. • Identify, agree and implement critical strategies for improvement (FGDM, concurrent planning, visits with children and parents, visits with children and workers, visits between workers and parents). • Supervisor development. • Identification and engagement of targeted partners • Culturally implement family centered practice 		
<p>Review/Reaffirm Purpose of Partnership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Draft MOU, Definitions, and Levels of Collaboration Documents • Discuss Partnership Challenges Handout- Mardell 	<p>It was decided that the MOU will be worked on at the next Admin Board meeting.</p>		

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
<p>Planning February 2009 Annual Partners Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University Partners Meeting--Shared Governance • Faculty Claim: Cost/ Benefit, Partnership Sustainability/ Scholars • Timing and Cost of Convening Partnership for Meeting 	<p><u>ANNUAL MEETING DECISION</u></p> <p>Meeting Price and Plan. Currently only Robert will be working on planning the annual meeting. The Operations Board will be the planning committee. The requested speaker was Mal O'Connor who has expertise in polarity. However his charge is \$10,000 so he was not considered. So there is no speaker and no planning team. The in-service section of the academy contract is the funding source for the annual meeting.</p> <p>Meeting Postponement. The feeling was that we are not ready for an annual meeting but can use the time in February to further solidify the Admin Board. In light of the current financial picture the Admin Board decided to delay the annual meeting until after the legislative session. It was decided to have Robert inform everyone of the postponing of the annual meeting using this sample structure: <i>“Due to current changes and organizational development within the Idaho Child Welfare Partnership, the Partnership’s Annual Meeting, which was scheduled for February 26th, 2009, has been postponed...”</i></p> <p>University Partner Meeting. It was decided to continue having the Admin Board meeting and the meeting with the university partners in February 2009. In these meetings the discussion will be around vision, mission and goals. The partners will be asked what they can bring to the table and what do they want to get out of the Partnership. There will also be reorientation of the Partnership’s structure. The Admin Board will meet on February 24th, 2009 and then meet with the university partners on February 25th, 2009. Both will be at the Casey facility. To summarize, the meetings will be held as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admin Board Mtg: Tues, Feb. 24th, 2009 from 1-5pm at Casey • University Mtg: Wed, Feb. 25th, 2009 from 8:30- 2pm at Casey <p><u>UNIVERSITY MEETING TOPICS</u></p> <p>Some talking points that were considered for discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broader Research. The universities can do published research for DHW that meets the need for child welfare with no additional funds or getting any other funds beyond IV-E. The definition being put forward is what is currently limiting them. • Broader Focus. We can do more if we broaden our focus and allow the partners 	<p>Postpone the Annual Meeting but still have the Admin Mtg on 2/24/09 and a meeting with the University Partners on 2/25/09.</p> <p>It was decided to have the discussion on faculty claim at the meeting with the university partners.</p>	<p>Robert will inform invitees of the annual meeting postponement.</p>

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION
	<p>to use their strengths. The vision and mission are currently limiting. We need to define how we make decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broader Vision. The Partnership should have a broader vision than just helping DHW. The broader vision is that the Partnership is helping children and families in Idaho. • Broader Goal. The Partnership should first pursue a goal and then look for ways to fund it. • Broader Information. The Admin Board should give an update on what is happening, how the Partnership has evolved and explain their plan to the university partners. <p>Robert can organize the call with the university partners some time after January 17th, 2008. This will be a time of confirmation for them and to prepare them for February's meeting.</p>		<p>Robert will organize the conference call with the university partners. This will take place after January 17th, 2009</p>
<p>Follow-up to "Undoing Racism" Training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of Disproportionality Plan -Mike 	<p>Undoing Racism Work. The Admin Board needs to include "Undoing Racism" as part of their work and be in agreement that this is critical for their work. Two trainers have been identified: Ray Mullenax and Erika Wainaina.</p> <p>Disproportionality Plan. A suggestion was given to the Practice Board that there is a IV-B Plan. Mardell's replacement can think of how to incorporate the IV-B plan as a Disproportionality Plan.</p>		
<p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2009 Meeting Schedule 	<p>Each of the partners expressed encouraging and appreciative words to Mardell in response to her plans to retire.</p>		