

Idaho Child Welfare Partnership Administrative Board Meeting

July 23rd, 2008 * 8:30AM - 4:00PM

BSU Social Work Department, Wallace Conference Room, Building 7

Attendees: Roxanne Printz, Mike Scholl, Kathy Tidwell, Chuck Halligan, Michelle Britton, Lynne Morris, Butch Rodenhiser, Mardell Nelson, Frank Sesek, Scott Tiffany
Guests: Ray Mullenax, Robert Hernandez (Notes)

AGENDA

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8:30 Welcome/Member Announcements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PIP ▪ Child Welfare Conference ▪ National Resource Center on Organizational Improvement ▪ New Turnover data? 	<p>Meeting began with introductions</p> <p><u>ANNOUNCEMENTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinician class is staying but will be used only for clinical role. • The System of Care, which provided CMH conference throughout the state, will be ending this September 2008. • EWU- Washington State is blending rural schools it includes more than just IV-E students and this encourages community building. Idaho was used as a model for this. • ICWRTC- The Center has moved and was up and running in three days. Carla Dvoracek is moving to a new position to be a professor. Roxanne will be the FFI until they hire another person to replace Carla. • An interpreter database is currently being developed and training is taking place. It will be a community kick-off with the ADA County Commissioners or Boise City Council. Once this takes place, they will meet and discuss long term ownership of website. FNA is supporting this project. • The Wilcox Conference will take place on October 17th, 2008. Dennis Saleebey will be at this conference. Dennis has written about empowerment and social work. • The Rural conference will be taking place July 25th and 26th, 2008 at BSU. • A Partnership Brochure draft has been done and will be going through revisions. • New FTE positions have been established. Frank is drafting a proposal for management analysis. They want someone who can do analysis. • In June 2008 Casey had Idaho Voices for Children. This is an advocacy group for policy. They convened around policy regarding kinship care with seven state legislators. This is to provide help and support for kinship care- financially, physically etc. This was very successful and it was noted that kinship care has been improving in the last five years. It was discovered that those providing kinship care prefer to be called “grand-families.” • The Philanthropy Northwest, which includes six northwest states, will speak of needs in the region. Mike Scholl is the Idaho representative from Casey and will help funders see points of entry for grantors to the child welfare systems. The Partnership and DHW can be receivers of private funding although child welfare is currently not their top priority. Their top priority revolves around education, community development, cultural/arts initiative, and poverty. The plan is to show how the Partnership works and how they can be part of it. • Work is being done on videos about where children are for those in corrections. Data will be retrieved over a period of time and a project of where it will end up will be made. 	

PIP

The Region 10 Feds have submitted the CFSR results to Washington DC and it will be 60 days later until we see anything. So the time for the final will be around October 2008.

In looking at activity around the PIP themes, areas already being done were picked since the CQI process was being done. Doing data profiling was also taking place. The Foster Care Community Planning still needs to have some work.

Engaging Families. Fathers have showed up continually. The Feds have high expectation to engage fathers since many are missing. DHW is looking at doing more to support families and Family Group Decision Making (FGDM). This key idea is used as a process, but the plan is to utilize this during the entire case. So ongoing engagement of fathers is now a focus.

Law Enforcement. Training is being done, especially with law enforcement and judges. Home studies are being done which needs to be streamlined in doing this work.

Improving Stability in Foster Care. This has been problematic but is showing some improvement. There is a strong emphasis on PRIDE as a model to help foster parents. There is a better use of concurrent planning and resources for children. Another challenge is that the children's behavior has not been a good match for foster parents. It takes 90 days to move a child which is not enough time for foster homes.

Maintaining Children Safely. 1.9 months is the average stay in foster homes so work needs to be done in looking at how to do sheltering and working with law enforcement. This means having a safety plan with the family. The use of reassessment tools, the courts and legal representation in placement of children is needed.

Process Mapping. Process mapping around adoption is currently being done. Each region was mapped and marks were placed where the delays occur. The purpose is to avoid the "50 item list" so the staff can work on this conceptually.

PIP Focus. The PIP will help keep focus. The PIP will be done as it was done before. Before it was central, but now it will be focused on different activities and regional PIPs. Engagement on the field level has not been happening, so now there is much more reliance on extending out to the regions. The plan is to try and hit key regions in doing the PIP. Each region does not have to be focused on the same thing.

Foster Care Numbers. The cost for foster care is 1 million less than last year but adoption is up 1 million, which is how it should be. Numbers are leveling off for foster care. As a result, legislators were convinced to allow non-discretionary funding. Since less of those funds are being used, DHW was able to go to legislative services and divert foster care funds to prevention and this was approved. The numbers will continue to decline at a slow rate.

PIP Standards. Because of the PIP there are more standards on how the work is done, which has also

helped. It was observed that the PIP is loaded with items and questions on what someone's role is. The key areas are the academy, the boards on foster care recruitment, therapeutic foster care, staff stability, training, data collecting showing why foster parents are leaving and disproportionality. Another question is where the partners should be at in this and how can those in the Partnership help with this plan. One idea is to look at the PIP and code each one as to what the roles would be for the coded items. One goal is to share the data with the partners. An invitation to division ops was given to the partners.

Since those on the boards are working on their logic models and are involved in the PIP, the PIP strategies came from these logic models. The bullets are not yet prioritized, but this is the beginning vision, which then gets translated to the contracts that goes to the universities. There is the state plan that is written and which lays out all the activities. The PIP can be color coded show how much of it is from board's logic model. The Partnership's three goals have set the framework.

The desire is to represent the schools outside the Partnership. The plan is to have Don Schmid help with the funding of this and fine tune where the partners fit and clarify their roles in this.

CHILD WELFARE CONFERENCE

Breakouts. This is the first annual conference which will involve all the partners and will take place from September 23rd-26th, 2008. The big emphasis is on improving moral, recognizing the workforce, and making it a fun event. How could the Partnership work on ideas to help workforce recognition? There will be a breakout about the Partnership to help staff understand it. There will be focus groups planned that are based on longevity and developmental needs (those there a year or less, two years or less, etc.). This will be looking for resilient behavior at different stages. There will also be a supervisor breakout to assess the supervisor's needs. The expectation is to get important information. Ideas for this have been generated from the Academy Evaluation group.

Honorariums for Presenters. What is intent of honorariums since this is part of the staff's work? Since they are doing something extra, the staff will be recognized as this is a moral booster and outside entities are charging fees. Casey cannot charge a fee but they can get acknowledgements in the form of honorariums. The honorarium is \$100 for speaking. The youths on the panels will also be getting an amount if they are over age eighteen. If they are under eighteen years, work will be done on how to provide them with honorariums. This is budgeted and is being paid by the contract. Discussions on how to handle this financially took place.

Conference Opportunities. This conference will be a way to collect data from those whom the data affects and create engagement. There is an opportunity to change the system and if that happens it will motivate the workforce. This will be a venue for each organization to show up and show off so that people could see the big picture and the means of support.

NATIONAL RESOURCE PLANNING

There is a need to attend to the supervisors and so negotiations with the National Resource Center (John and Sara) have taken place in order to facilitate a year planning to engage managers to set a vision. This will

	<p>occur October 14th and 15th. 2008. This time will be split between managers, university partner members and supervisor focus groups for support, training and organizational change to help them move into a new role as organization change agents for Family Centered Practice. They will meet at various times to move the system. It was stressed that supervisors need support, especially in the difficult decisions that are being made.</p> <p><u>TURNOVER DATA CLARIFICATION</u></p> <p>Accurate Report. Last year the turnover rate was 18.6%, the year before it was 21%. Reports were that the turnover rate is now 22%; however more accurate data shows that the turnover rate was around 12%, not 22%. The previous report had inaccurate data. The hope is for a lower trend and numbers will be rechecked. The vacancy rate is also declining; this is conforming to national figures which are also lowing.</p> <p>Career Ladder. Building a retention strategy has resulted in a more diverse opportunity for the career ladder. Evaluating candidates for Social Worker III, which is mentoring, is now taking place. This position is for individuals who are very experienced and an MSW is not required. The Academy has helped with this.</p>	
<p>9:15 Logic Model - in-depth report on accomplishments and challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scholars Board - Ray Mullenax ▪ Accomplishment/Challenges of other boards 	<p><u>SCHOLARS BOARD REPORT</u></p> <p>Membership. Ray Mullenax, Chairman of the Scholars Board, gave a report on the Scholars Board. The Scholars Board currently has good representation with about fourteen members on the board. Christelle Edmo has just recently joined the board and they are thinking of having alumni join as well. This board has cross representation from other boards and also has a program specialist. This cross representation helps provide communication from other boards and provides perspective on how the Scholars Board fits within the bigger picture of the Partnership.</p> <p>Logic Model. Ray indicated that the logic model was challenging due to the shift in thinking it caused. Their focus was on two Partnership areas and they came up with activities. They also came up with the Student Institute as this flowed for them. They have enough activities to keep them busy. The challenge for the logic model is to make it functional; to operationalize and keep it alive and moving. The action takers are motivating the group to participate. In order to move the meeting, the agenda was revised as they looked at what was accomplished and keep new things in logic model. Because the group is action-oriented, they are doing the action and then placing what was done in the logic model.</p> <p>Scholar Board Needs. There is a need to break down barriers and challenges and to see where they are going. Work is being done to involve tribal representation, but this outcome has not yet happened. They need the Admin Board's support to help accomplish what is not yet being done. The board also needs data from the Evaluation Board. The board is currently working a diversity plan around each university in their attempts at recruiting students.</p> <p>A suggestion was given to report a year from now on how the logic model has worked on focusing on challenges and addressing issues. This would assist with reviewing how well this is working.</p> <p>Children's Mental Health (CMH). The board would like input from CMH to help facilitate a decision on the role of CMH with the Scholar's Program. They have connected with managers at the local level on how the Partnership has worked in CMH but this is not in the forefront on the managers' agenda so CMH has other concerns as a priority. There needs to be both field coordinators and managers working together to</p>	

	<p>promote the Partnership to CMH. The recruitment of foster parents and therapeutic foster care can be a Partnership promotion. The Scholars Board desires a better connection with CMH for statistical information.</p> <p>It was brought up that because of the higher amount of Adult Mental Health (AMH) managers; CMH is not getting a lot of attention. Work can be done to show how this links with AMH and its relevancy.</p>	
<p>10:15 Break</p>		
<p>10:30 Continued Discussion about Boards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Practice Development Board challenges of fit – Constituency Engagement and Plan for developing The Disproportionality Plan –Mike, Mardell ▪ Review and input on revised reporting document proposal - Mardell 	<p>ACTION BOARDS’ REPORTING</p> <p>Board Report Form. Discussion revolved around the type of reports that the boards are to submit in response to Admin Board’s request to have a different reporting format which is to include an “Outcomes” section that answers the “so what.” These outcomes are organized around the three primary Partnership goals. This report also includes a Board Operations column to describe what each particular board is doing in its own operations. Along with the “Challenges” section, the report now has a “Suggested Solutions” section with a “Target Date.” This format is still in draft form to see if it will work for the Admin Board. It was suggested to have a date range in each report.</p> <p>Feedback Loop. There will be a feedback box in the report so that the Admin Board can provide feedback back to the Action Boards. This feedback loop is not yet developed. A way to get this feedback loop developed is by having the Operations Committee process the challenges and move them up to the Admin Board. The Admin Board then decides what to do with each challenge and brings that information down to each board through the Operations Committee members. Since these board challenges are for the Admin Board to work on, a standard agenda item at each Admin Board meeting would be to review the challenges that are presented.</p> <p>PRACTICE DEVELOPMENT BOARD</p> <p>Challenges. This board is still at the conceptual level and is more in conversation, not tasks. The other boards are connected to contracts with universities and have a history and programs. It has been difficult for the Practice Development Board to find a place and so they have been putting an emphasis on mitigating disparate outcomes and constituency engagement. They see themselves perhaps as advisory board. They have ideas but don’t know how to get them into DHW or even if they can. There is a process challenge with this board. Frustration has been expressed because they do not know where to take their ideas. The board had two good ideas. The first was TAP integration into DHW. They proposed a model to the program committee, but were denied. This frustrated them. Their other proposal was to pay staff for PRIDE. This also was denied by the Program Committee. So it looks as if all they do goes to the Program Committee rather than the Admin Board. The issue was one of boundaries.</p> <p>Recommendation. It was observed this is a board that can make recommendations after researching. They would not be the final decision maker, but can research on how to impact practices. They may be able to do parts of their recommendation after making a presentation to the whole Admin Board, rather than going to the Program Committee. The protocol would be for this board to approach the Admin Board first with their proposal as there may be more potential for some of their proposal to be done. If one group is not able to do something another may be able to.</p>	<p>Reviewing Challenges as Agenda Item</p> <p>Put date range in reports</p>

	<p>Board Functions. The Practice Development Board’s role may be to ground the other boards. If so, perhaps they are an advisory board. They are involved in constituency engagement and foster care alumni. They need direction as they have been floundering for work that they could be doing. They have worked around constituency engagement and disproportionality. The follow are items the Practice Development Board can work on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They can continue with family center practice and working with older youth. • For the PIP, they can engage foster parents and children in court- providing different models for preparing children for court. They could be advised of PIP elements and where they can be involved. • Continue focusing on best practices under the umbrella of disproportionality and stakeholder engagement. • Have the other boards seek this board on success with families and worker retention. They can pose this question: Which practice works with the best staff success and retention? • Continue doing research on disproportionality and write the state plan as a draft, working with the other boards and having their logic models put into the state plan. This would link Practice Development to other boards. • Plan to feature Practice Board at next Admin Board meeting. • Define this board as both an operating board and advisory board. • Focus on best practice for recruiting, retention, and mitigating disparate outcomes. The Admin Board will help them see their role within these three areas when it comes to best practices. • Have a meeting with Frances, Steve, Mardell, Mike, Kathy, Roxanne, Julie, Megan and have areas of PIP for constituency engagement and other areas of focus. It was discussed to involve the chiefs in this to avoid any disconnect. <p>Charter. The Practice Development Board started their work based on their charter but was then diverted to the logic model which caused them to re-plan. It was suggested to send out the charter and logic model in order to take another look at the Admin Board’s role and review what their charge is. The Operations Board will work with the Practice Board after reviewing their charter and logic model. They will then bring a report to present to the next Admin Meeting. They can have a conference call in between. In reviewing the charter, they can have Lynn and Ross as chiefs.</p> <p>The Practice Board’s Charter was passed around for all to review. It was observed that the charter can still serve as its logic model.</p> <p>Julie Stevens, the Practice Board Chair, will be at the next Admin Board meeting.</p>	<p>Charge for Practice Board to work on</p> <p>Operations Board will work with the Practice Board after reviewing their charter and logic model.</p> <p>Have Practice Development Board at next Admin Board Meeting</p>
<p>11:15 Funding Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lessons learned from grant writing – Roxanne, Kathy, Butch ▪ DUs to refinance Academy and Partnership Director 	<p>GRANT LESSONS LEARNED</p> <p>The Partnership structure has been useful in figuring out how to cross organizational boundaries that are functional and not to cross where they are not functional. There was a consensus that the partners will be much better prepared for the next grant opportunity. The challenge is how a decision can be made when they are not convened and maintaining the communication. It was difficult mobilizing the system to get the grant going.</p> <p>Future Grant Plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look for grant opportunities that advance the three goals of the Partnership. • Make preparations for upcoming grants. 	

positions and move them from IDHW – Michelle, Mardell

- The power of convening and how the Partnership can make an impact on the state in contrast to a region.
- Partnership relationship with the grant offices.
- Funding- How to work to get the match or in-kind to get the grant.
- How the Partnership is to do the convening for the grant.
- When a grant is found, post it to the Admin Board members to begin discussion on who can do the grant.

Lead School and MOU. The term ‘Lead School’ has different meanings. This still needs to be resolved. The Admin Board needs to define what this ‘Lead School’ means. This needs to start with the MOU in order to get the language clear and then populate the other documents. The MOU does indicate that the Admin Board is to approve grants. It was decided to review the MOU for the next Admin meeting and have Operations Committee recommend any changes and define the term- ‘Lead School.’ The Admin Board has to take responsibility for the putting into policy that which is recommended by the Operations Committee. It was agreed to include Department of Behavioral Health (DBH). If they do join, then the entire MOU will have to be rewritten. Scott Tiffany is the designee from DBH, so the MOU will be rewritten.

It was agreed not to overdo the next meeting agenda so that the Admin Board will have sufficient time to go through the MOU. How decisions are made should be clarified in the MOU.

DECISION UNIT (DU)

A submission was made for Academy, the work of the Chief, and the Director for Partnership. These are on the list for DU but there is no guarantee. The first draft was submitted this week. This won’t be forwarded until September 2008 and the waiting period for this will be until January 2009. These documents came from a Don Schmid consultation.

Contractor. Since contracts are a key to DHW, there was discussion on who the next FACS Contract Monitor will be should Mardell move to the Partnership Director position. PET for FACS and Partnership Director are two positions and need to be separated. It was agreed that if there is another Contract Monitor, this person should be able to see how Partnership operates. Oscar Morgan and Brian Baldwin are board chairs who are currently doing contract monitoring. The Scholars Contract Monitor is a challenge since there is a need to know both systems. Part of this is contingent on defining the Partnership Director duties. If the Director presents the Partnership work so that the Contract Monitor can easily see what needs to be done, then the Director is helping the Monitor do his/her work. Oregon was mentioned as a state already doing this.

It was recommended to have time on the next agenda for discussion on Academy and the Partnership Director not being an IDHW employee.

Funding. It was discussed that there may be a possible need of a backup plan in case of retirement. Looking at funds and there currently is little funding. There may be the ability to use existing funds and watch the spending in order to avoid overspending. Funds may be available for the Director position or to fill the position from an outside source. Work through the budget process needs to be done and work can be done at the next meeting for the Director and Academy.

Review the MOU and have Operations Committee recommend any changes and define lead school.

Put Academy and Partnership Director on next agenda.

<p>12:00 Working Lunch- Continued Funding Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Casey funding being loaded and leveraged –Mike, Frank ▪ Planning for Don Schmid Consultation (Preferred Availability Sept 29th - Oct 3rd OR alternative week of Oct 20 - 24) ▪ Consultation Schedule and Agenda - Mardell 	<p>CASEY FUNDING Matching. Casey is supplying \$20,000 for the Child Welfare Conference. The question of how much IV-E was leverage from the amount that Casey has given was brought up. The formula for providing the match was discussed.</p> <p>DON SCHMID IV-E CONSULTATION Available Dates. The dates that Don Schmid is available are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 29th- October 3rd, 2008 • October 20th- October 24th, 2008 <p>Decision Date. Since October 20th-24th is the same week that the budget reviews take place and those conducting the budget reviews need to be at the consultation, it was agreed that the consultation will take place the week of September 29th-October 3rd, 2008. The following agenda items were scheduled for this consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9/29/08- Orientation 9/30/08- Consultation with Admin Board 10/1/08- Consultation with Management Services and CMH in the morning and evening respectively. 10/3/08- Exit Consultation <p>The objective for this consultation is to maximize funding and make appropriate claims. As such, it would be good to have the directors, deputy directors, and grant offices in the consultation.</p> <p>Utah and Washington were looked at as examples for funding. Management Services were then approached with this, but this became a barrier.</p>	
<p>1:30 Shared Governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Re-Schedule - University Partner Meeting ▪ Agenda Discussion - shared governance, joint funding and future direction ▪ Reschedule the Annual Meeting (November 18-19 conflict) Need to reschedule to January or February) 	<p>UNIVERSITY PARTNER MEETING University Representation. Faculty claiming has not started due to the challenge of engaging the other universities and their representatives. There was also a challenge on representation from the schools as they did not get election from universities. So there is currently no new affiliate university representative. It was agreed that there is a need to discuss with the university how they want to be represented. When they were asked for nominations, no one was interested. They were also contacted to be part of a meeting with the Admin Board, but no one responded.</p> <p>MEETING DATES Next Admin Meeting. The next Admin Board Meeting is scheduled for November 20th, 2008 at Casey Family Programs.</p> <p>Next Annual Meeting. The two tentative Annual Meeting Dates are:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Annual Mtg First Choice: February 25th-26th, 2009; Admin Board Meeting on February 24th, 2009 Annual Mtg Second Choice: February 10th-11th, 2009; Admin Board Meeting on February 12th, 2009</p> <p>The affiliate universities will be contacted to know their preference for the Annual Meeting before finalizing a date.</p>	<p>Contact affiliate universities to determine Annual Meeting date.</p>

<p>1:45 Shared Data -Update on Chapin Hall Database - Frank</p>	<p>CHAPIN HALL Data Management. With Casey funding this project, Brian Baldwin was able to participate in Chapin Hall, which helps states collect, analyze and hypothesize the data that is collected. They do data management for states. Because of their interest in the 20/20 plan, it makes sense for Casey to help with this. This is currently in the beginning stages of a formal relationship. There is the collecting all foster care information that Casey is tracking which can be used for a national comparison. When foster care data is sent to Chapin Hall, they have a way of asking a different set of questions where there is hypothesis for certain outcomes rather than a re-hashing of the data. The timeframe for the results is three to four months from the reception of the data. So a tentative date when this data would be received is January 2009. Casey would be the recipient of this data. Once loaded, a variety of questions can be asked with new data either each quarter or every six months. Work is being done on coordinating information from the legal system.</p> <p>Contracting Chapin. A contract between IDHW and Chapin Hall is needed that will detail what each entity will do and for what cost. Chapin will send their contract and DHW reject it and send theirs based on some items from the Chapin contract. The contract process will be two to three months so it should be developed by October 2008.</p> <p>This is one of the best opportunities and by next meeting should have a proposed agreement.</p>	<p>Have a proposed agreement with Chapin Hall by next Admin Board meeting.</p>
<p>2:00 Update on Children’s Mental Health System – Scott Tiffany</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General Questions 	<p>CHILDREN’S MENTAL HEALTH CMH Partnership Commitment. CMH’s commitment to the Partnership’s principles was reiterated. They are committed to working together. A list of CMH volunteers for membership on each board was given. Part of CMH’s lack of involvement revolved around confusion and growing pains. The question was posed whether or not CMH sees the Partnership aligning with them. It was agreed that it was. There are similar commitments to the same people, similar models, and similar care. This lines up with Partnership.</p> <p>CMH Funding. CMH does wants to get out of IV-E and see what can replace it. How can they justify the funding they receive? The current thinking is to use Title 21 funds. They still need to work on funding.</p>	
<p>2:30 Break</p>		
<p>2:45 Continued Board Discussion on Children’s Mental Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need for Addendum to Partnership Agreement and Casey State Strategy Agreement ▪ Issue Paper from Boards regarding challenges of engaging CMH ▪ IV-E Funding Challenges 	<p>CMH PRACTICE CMH Modifications. CMH is looking at how they can change their role from brokers of service to a focus on service effectiveness. This role would attempt to answer the question: “Is the child getting better?” Best Practice and Evidence Based Practice look at the outcomes. They are looking at more standardized tools to measure outcomes. Work is being done with Medicaid since 70% of the children come out of Medicaid. They are looking at policy, caseload studies, and improving the CQI process. This is for the entire Mental Health Department. After reviewing the exit interviews, they are looking at staffing and supervision. It makes sense for their participation in John and Sara’s consultation.</p> <p>CMH Board Representation. It was asked if Heather from CMH could be on the Resource Family Board since she understands that and can help with recruitment. This would be Kathleen’s decision.</p>	

<p>3:30 Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Next Meeting date location▪ Agenda Items	<p>The following items were listed as agenda items for the next Admin Board Meeting on November 20th, 2008 at the Casey Family Programs' facility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review and Revision of MOU• Chapin Hall Update• Strategic Plan with Practice Board• Feedback Form• Decision Unit on Academy and Partnership Director• Annual Meeting Date	
--	--	--