

**Idaho Child Welfare Partnership
Administrative Board Meeting**

May 23, 2008

8:30AM-4:00PM

Casey Family Program Office, 6441 W. Emerald

Attendance:

Michelle Britton- FACS Division
Frank Sesek – FACS Division
Mardell Nelson – FACS Division
Butch Rodenhiser – BSU School Social Work
Scott Tiffany- DBH Division, CMH Program
Lynne Morris- EWU School of Social Work

Roxanne Printz – ICWRTC, EWU
Patty Gregory – ICWRTC, EWU
Mike Scholl -Casey Family Program
Mike Frumkin – EWU School of Social Work

Guests:

Steve Seale – IDHW, Management Services
Rick Phillips –ICWRTC (Evaluation Board)
Robert Hernandez – ICWRTC (Note Taker)

AGENDA

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|---|--|--------|
| <p>8:30 Welcome/Introductions and Partner Announcements</p> | <p>The meeting began with introductions, new personnel, leaving personnel, acknowledgments, and announcements.</p> <p>Personnel Changes EWU – Dean Mike Frumkin is leaving his position at EWU and Dr. Lynne Morris will be taking his place on the board in the interim until a new dean is hired.</p> <p>ICWRTC Director- Roxanne Printz is now the new Director for the ICWRTC.</p> <p>Scholars Project Coordinator- Patty Gregory is now Project Coordinator for the Scholars Program/Academy and transition interface.</p> <p>Partnership Administrative Support- Robert Hernandez will be the new administrative support for the Partnership.</p> <p>Announcements ICWRTC- The ICWRTC in northern Idaho will be moving to a new larger facility due to personnel growth. Julie Pratt, who has a communications background, has been hired for the RPM program. EWU plans to network the new facility, which will include the ability to videoconference.</p> | |

EWU- The Eastern Washington School of Social Work (SSW) received an intensive site visit for reaccreditation and it went very well. The hard work that was done paid off with a great visit. The role of EWU, SSW with graduates moving to leadership positions was impressive. Mention was also made of the schools involvement with the Idaho Child Welfare Research and Training Center.

CMH- The Children's Mental Health Program is putting the finishing touches to the system improvement plan outcome of service

Communications Work Group- A communications team has been formed that will work on improving internal and external communications for the Partnership. This will include literature, PowerPoint presentations, intranet, newsletters, press releases, and a display booth for conferences.

ICWP Administration- With our new administrative support, an office will be formed that will have records properly organized and maintained. Workgroups are forming with details to come later.

BSU- BSU is working on more accreditation and will be hosting the 33rd Annual National Institute on Social Work and Human Services in Rural Areas Conference, which takes place the week of July 24th-27th, 2008. This is an opportunity for the Partnership to have a national presence.

IDHW- The Children and Family Services Review (CSFR) went very well and the Children and Family Services Program eighteen new positions, which will be allocated in July.

The IDHW, CFS Program is currently increasing capacity, reducing workloads, and this is being noticed. There is a project starting to simplify adoption work and paperwork using process mapping. We will look at the entire process from adoption to permanency in selected counties, research why terminations are appealed, as well as evaluate the automation. Due to court complaints, data for the past three years is being analyzed, as well as any other needed information, to justify what needs to be contracted. There is also work on family preservation and on-call. With the turnover rate at 8%, the director and governor offices are interested in helping with salary improvement. There is a workforce challenge with keeping workers who are working within the legal part of the system.

CASEY- The theme for the Sun Valley Court Improvement gathering is children having a voice in court from beginning to end. This included consultation and the need for attorneys to represent child.

9:15
Legislative Update-Michelle
▪ Lack of Spending Authority

SPENDING AUTHORITY
Getting positions is difficult, so having eighteen approved to fill is good.

- TANF Shortfall, Impact on Efforts to Refinance & Need for Further Refinancing

IV-E Financing Update
Resulting from Don Schmid Consult
–Group Discussion

- University Claiming
- Challenges and Philosophy Regarding Joint Financing
- Grant Writing – Opportunities and Challenges
- Pending Grant Proposal - Roxanne
- DHW Program Actions Resulting from Consult
- Action Updates and Proposals Regarding Personnel Transfers to Leverage IV-E Funds and Generate FTE (Foster Parent Trainers, Admin Support, Academy Trainers, Partnership Director)
- Need for Additional Don Schmid Consultation and Training Due to New Challenges and Turnover

Although there is opportunity working with universities, there are also challenges. The challenge comes in moving around budgets--personnel, operations, capital outlay, trustee and benefit. Of these, operations is the most difficult to fund, because if the funds are not from the general fund, there is a ceiling. The spending has increased and the university contracts are taking a big part of spending authority.

We need to get specific on how to spend. More operating comprises the budget. Operating expenses are near the spending authority and cannot be taken out of T&B for operating. To make a budget request for hiring university-based academy trainers is a partnership position, but without the spending authority we cannot proceed. There needs to be specific information on how much of this portion will be from general funds. A proposal to request a supplemental could be done sooner, but those in charge will be picky as to what is considered a supplemental emergency request. The expansion of the university contract may be put off until July 2009.

TANF FUNDING

TANF has been increasing in the university contracts. Without Congressional reauthorization there will be 3.5 million less TANF dollars available for Idaho, by 2010. As the economy goes down, the demand for TANF goes up. TANF is being obligated for other purposes. No additional TANF dollars can be obtained, since 19.5 million of TANF already is already going to child welfare in Idaho.

The Legislative Auditor does not like using TANF for the university contracts and has wanted to know how the universities use the funds. The auditor has a bias that TANF does not belong to child welfare. The auditor has indicated that \$50,000 is the most that should be used from TANF-EA for the foster care training contracts, since there is now so little TANF spending on foster care placement. As a result, work is being done to get other funding strategies in place and write a solid response to the auditor.

We are seeking Federal Region X input/support regarding the continued implementation of our approved state plan, to explain to the auditor why 1.5 million from TANF is okay to use for University contracts. The TANF situation will be stable for the next year, but a lot of details need to be worked on, so that by July 2009 there is something in place which relies more on IV-E and maximization of university match. Since the University match generates IV-E and this accounts for 75% of the training funding and 50% operating funds, there needs to be a better way to depict the way this matching is achieved.

Mardell has attempted to contact Don Schmid to see if he is interested and available to assist with IV-E funding consultation. He has not yet responded.

Seek another in-depth consultation from Don Schmid

IV-E FINANCING UPDATE

Some of the strategies for reducing the TANF impact were discussed.

Scholars Program. This contract has already been refinanced by making sure all of stipend students are working with IV-E eligible children. By making this service exclusive, this will allow a claim for 75%, which is about \$200,000 savings. This savings has already been earmarked for Head Start.

Don Schmid had identified various projects that can be done. The first is the university claiming on the faculty, but there are challenges on how to do this. One barrier has been the IDHW Budget Analyst's understanding the cost of education. Also, we have researched two state methods for claiming---Utah and Washington. The Utah model would result in a \$40,000 benefit to BSU. The Washington model applies the resource generated from faculty claiming of all participating universities to the whole program claim, which makes the stipend program cost neutral to the state. This is a sustainability plan for their Scholars Program. Since the State of Washington does not contribute anything financial to the IV-E education program, the universities can grow the program as large as there are agency field education placements available and students willing to commit to the work obligation. All the universities contribute the faculty time charge as part of the match, which will save Washington money.

There was an agreement to contact Jan Hawkler, in Washington, to see how they are drawing down IV-E, using less TANF and getting it approved by Candace (Region X).

Disbursing Funds Generated by Partnership. Mike Frumkin raised the need for philosophical agreement that the funds generated by the Partnership go to the Partnership. Thus it is not how a particular department wants to spend the funds, but how historically the Partnership has emerged and spent the resources collectively on faculty and students. This is not an exclusive IDHW decision. It comes down to whose money is it? Who decides how to spend it? And the need to create a sustainability plan. This cannot be seen as benefiting one university over another. If this happens, Mike warned we would risk losing participation from the other sub-contracted universities. There needs to be more resources in the Partnership to develop more projects that all can participate in. We need to provide incentives so that if the larger schools give to the whole, there is more incentive for the smaller schools to come in.

Things can be done to encourage them to be part of Partnership. Negotiating a higher indirect rate can be done (example--from 8% to 10%). Also, this is reimbursable. The university would get the established percentage back and then they could use those funds how they wanted. The reality is that without the Partnership, the university could not have obtained the faculty generated funds. However, with an increased indirect rate, we create incentive.

Contact Jan Hawkler to see how they are drawing down IV-E and less TANF and having it Candace approved.

Improve communication so everyone on the Admin Board is aware of what the Partnership is doing regarding grant applications.

Get all the University Partners around the table and get them on board with the recommendation to make faculty claims in order to increase shared Partnership resources. This would require having them provide information on how many IV-E students they have in relationship to number of faculty.

Discuss better/desired ways to have them participate and be represented.

The indirect rate first covers the cost. The match doesn't cover the cost. This is no different than a grant. There is no federal cap at 8%, so the rate is negotiable. The concern with this idea is that the contracts can add more indirect, but then more indirect funds will likely be siphoned off to other parts of the University, rather than staying in the Social Work Departments. This would have to be negotiated up front.

It is like writing a grant and use 8% as the upfront match. The principle is that anything benefitted from the Partnership is put back into Partnership and grows the Partnership. The principle is the basis or starting point and then we figure out ways to make it happen.

Mike S. brought up that Casey is involved in the Partnership, because of the Partnership's child welfare cause. He is clear that funding generation needs to be toward that end.

If we accept the principle that whatever is generated by partnership needs to go back to partnership, the next step is to dispel myth that this partnership is only EWU or BSU, but that it is for other schools, as well. The smaller schools may be asking the question, "Why are we here?" The Partnership needs to think about how to include them more effectively, especially if we intend to increase the claim using faculty time.

Regarding the current grant writing funding effort, "How will the current grant benefit the Partnership?" Since the first year of the workforce grant calls for planning, everything can be put on the table including identifying each university's role in the Partnership.

If there is no maximizing of resources for the Partnership now, there will be erosion in programs. There now needs to be sustainability planning, before developing more programs/projects. Also, we need some collaborative efforts among the university partners to become better partners and buy into the Partnership. It was brought up that the California IV-E (CALSWEC) includes all social work schools in California, not just the big ones.

Grant Proposal. There was a concern expressed about the work on the current grant and why this was not completely communicated throughout the Partnership. This is due to short timeframes and the way the grant was structured--requiring a university applicant and our current relationships with grants offices.

The MOU has joint funding language, but there is really not enough funding in the grant to do much except to facilitate some convening for planning; complete the required and very prescribed evaluation; and offer a few stipends.

Work to have a grant writer from each university collaborate together to locate other resources. Consider a pooled resource for match.

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>In the future, the Partnership could be an entity that generates grants--a legal entity managing the grant. The Admin Board includes all partners and team effort.</p> <p>There was consensus that there needs to be a better way to communicate to members of Admin Board, so that all are informed when something happens. The Operations Committee was delegated to handle the tasks.</p> <p>All decision-making and communication should have the mindset of the Partnership's infrastructure.</p> | |
| <p>10:30 Break</p> | | |
| <p>10:45 Logic Model – Rick Phillips</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Status on Boards' Development ▪ Next Steps for the Admin Board | <p>Each board has taken the outcomes and measures set by the Operations Board and established logic models. The boards have been consulting with Rick Phillips to better improve their logic models. They are working on identifying and operationalizing strategies related to the outcome that has been set by Operations and Administrative Boards.</p> <p>Activity Plan. Each board is to have strategies around each challenge and use the Activity Plan to help focus them and accomplish something between meetings. This determines success- what is done, and who does it.</p> <p>It will probably be another 6-months before all members of all boards participate in this. Those who are action oriented have the Activity Plan working for them more than those who primarily want to meet, conceptualize and advise.</p> <p>The hope is that by the time of the annual meeting each board defines its roles and responsibilities and that each board thoroughly understands what it represents. It was suggested that the Admin Board help narrow the focus of each board.</p> <p>It was recommended that each board try to include such members as an IDHW human resources person, a budget person, and/or a FOCUS person, in its membership, in order to provide the needed perspectives for decisions. Currently, the Scholars and Academy Boards have Human Resources representatives.</p> <p>Each board is working on the three goals the Administrative Board has set. Recruitment, Retention, and Disparity of youth with color.</p> <p>It was noted that there has been an increase in Hispanics in the past year, so the goal is to become educated with what is involved with the Hispanic population. The spin off is that this can be built into the curriculum for social work. Another</p> | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>area would be training in Academy around legal issues. The current challenge to this is that there are no attorneys to help.</p> <p>The Feds have acknowledged that Idaho has made great progress on statewide collaboration.</p> <p>Two primary challenges that have come up are needs for data and communication.</p> | |
| <p>12:00 Working Lunch Operations Board Reports -Handouts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elections – Updates and Leadership Rotation | <p>Due to the large number of leadership changes, it was recommended and the group reached consensus, to continue the same leadership team for the next year. Michelle and Mike, through Mardell will continue to communicate with other members as far as agenda items.</p> <p>After Michelle’s term, the next leadership team was to be Mike S. and Bill. Since Bill’s term has expired, it does not make sense to have a new university partner representative move directly into a co-chair role. Mike Frumkin was the next in line, but due to his departure, the Board agreed that Mike S. and Butch would be the next co-chairs, beginning in July 2009.</p> <p>Children’s Mental Health will be involved in partnership. This needs more clarification.</p> <p>As the Action Boards hit barriers, this will impact the universities. Thus the structure of representation needs to be re-worked. A plan was developed to bring them to the table for our next meeting. The invitation is to come from Administrative Board to the universities and discover how they want to participate, give them the financial picture, discuss plans for the future, and having the Partnership as entity on its own, separated from IDHW.</p> <p>Meeting time – Tentatively, July 23rd or July 24th.</p> | <p>Moved, second, and approved.</p> <p>Communicate agenda items.</p> <p>Mike and Mardell to work on sequencing of leadership rotation.</p> <p>Invite other universities to send a representative to the next Admin Board meeting and work on structure and how university partners meet.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Celebration of Members Transitions | <p>Good-byes were said to Patty Gregory and Mike Frumkin. Positive words were expressed to both of them regarding their contributions---their legacy was acknowledged. Bill Clouser’s contributions we acknowledged, in his absence.</p> | <p>Mardell to send Bill his card and recognition for his service on the Admin Board and in helping establish the Partnership</p> |

12:45

Evaluation Board Presentation - Brian Baldwin

- Evaluation Board Reports- Handouts
- Chapin Hall Database
- Evaluation Process Map and Framework
- Student Evaluation Projects – Scholars Program and Research Class
- Disproportionality Data

FDGM- Family Group Decision Making handouts were circulated on the data compiled by Dr. Byrnes was included. The information resources from Regions 1 and 2 only are currently available. This could be a model that could develop into a state report.

Supervisor Focus Group Data Summary- This was given to program managers. The feedback is that the supervisors love this method of data input. They take the ideas and discussion and put into practice. John Alderson and Sara Jarvis, our family centered practice consultants from the National Resource Center on Organizational Improvement are coming back to Idaho to provide a year of consultation and planning regarding changing the role of supervisors to organizational change agents for the practice we seek. Creating learning circles to engage supervisors and promote critical thinking is a start and the plans are to expand.

Idaho Foster Parent Exit Summary- A lists of the questions and results were integrated into Idaho's CFSR self-study. One challenge is to do a better job in matching foster parent with children. Also, the data indicates 3 types of foster parent applicants---those committed to long-term placement of difficult children, kin care providers and those seeking adoption through foster care or just testing out their interest in fostering. We need to learn more about what group takes which children and being much more strategic about placement decisions, in order to improve foster care stability and permanency outcomes. Next, the Resource Family Evaluation is moving to foster parent satisfaction--why parents are staying? and how to support them? There also need to be able to distinguish the types of children in the foster care system (danger vs. troubling child).

Scholars Data- This reports the total number graduating and hired. It notes exclusions---non-compliance with work obligation and deferral. It shows where things are headed in hiring year to year. Human Resource has showed up at the student institute for recruiting purposes and they disseminate the report in the regions, so registers can be watched for good potential hires.

Partnership Database- This is being built in a protected environment---It is also password protected, example: a signed consent from the foster parents is needed to put their data in the system. This is currently conceptual. Once the data is up, it is up to the Admin Board to determine who has access to it. The purpose of the database is to have a central location for Partnership access to data in order to minimize efforts to obtain data that promotes the goals of the partnership.

Chapin Hall-They are looking at how child welfare reporting is done—it is mostly retrospective. There should be a change in the framework on how to have the data gathered, so that it is forward looking. Having entry cohorts help

with looking forward and providing something predictable in assessing the data and knowing what to do with it. It allows a look at the differences and tells us if we are going in right direction. They are working on the disparity ratio and thinking through the questions regarding what we need/want to get and how to get it.

Brain sought the Board's approval to acquire the Chapin Hall database (Casey has agreed to fund the first year costs). If approved, the FOCUS data will be exported to Chapin Hall, who will then put it into their system for reporting. This would cost about \$20,000 annually and IV-E funds can be used, in the future. They will do a consultation while this happens. About ten to twelve states are already using this.

Once there is a FOCUS data person FTE to help with this, Brian will contact Chapin and include Mike in the communications. Words such as: The Administrative Board approved your offer for continued relationship....

Evaluation Framework- This is to work through decisions and can be modified. Suggestion--A phrase such as "Projects authorized by ICWP" can be in the framework.

Diagram- Shows how the framework could be used to the Admin Board who would then take it to the faculty. The university has two sets of students, some from research classes and some IV-E students doing Partnership projects. Both are seeking access to IDHW data, but the preference is that IV-E students gaining access for projects benefiting the Partnership. Also, following the protocol is key to being able to disseminate data so that it can be purposefully used for quality improvement purposes. We need cooperation from the Deans and Directors regarding directing students on how to access data through the Evaluation Board and according to the protocol. This will only occur when all the schools are at the table.

Matrix- This tracks all the agency evaluations and will be posted on the Partnership website.

Foster Care Disproportionality Data- This shows if/how the foster child placement data mirrors the rest of the population. It shows that Native American children are four times more likely than whites to end up in care. It also compares Hispanic with non-Hispanic. For future data collection, it would be good to check the children according to age.

Staff Disproportionality Data- Human Resources has reported that ethnic/racial diversity is less than 1 percent in the workforce. **Challenges:** It was noted that if someone does not fill the race/ethnicity section on the form, it defaults to white. Thus, this data is not accurate. Also, Idaho is not an

Board approved acquisition of the Chapin Hall Data Base.

Get a FOCUS data person FTE. Brian and Mike will contact Chapin and work on providing them with the FOCUS download.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>affirmative action agency. Department legal complications can arise related to how we disseminate information or do “special recruitment”. HR does want to join with us in helping us recruit and we may need/want to access legal consultation as we move forward with activities.</p> <p>Foster Parent Disproportionality Data -Foster Parent data is obtained by forms that are completed and placed in the database. Foster parent data is entered and tracked through FOCUS for race. The Fed government has an outcome measurement on CFSR instrument that holds states accountable for keeping children within their culture and community.</p> <p>Challenge: The Partnership’s source of data on foster parents is from training, not from licensing, or FOCUS. Our goal is to have updated data in other databases and have a means by which the database can automatically show closeouts on foster parents, so that system does not have to be manually purged each month.</p> | |
| <p>2:00 Proposed Partnership Disproportionality Plan –Mike and Mardell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Practice Board Recommendation ▪ Continued Discussion and Next Steps | <p>We are currently at a 1st draft stage of writing the state/partnership plan. The data above has been the first challenge in moving forward. The Practice Development Board has been focused on the needs and challenges of implementing a statewide disproportionality plan that encompasses all the systems in the partnership. Also the various Boards have started identifying and implementing strategies in their logic model. As of yet, there is no overarching direction on how to create readiness and prepare the organizational cultures for system-wide change. Several Partnership members will be attending the upcoming PIP stakeholder meeting, at which this subject will no doubt be integrated into the PIP plan recommendations. Brian will continue to provide data, as we move through though the planning and implementation process.</p> <p>The Boards are waiting for Admin Board to signal (more that just the setting of 3 priority goals) on what direction they should take. Mike and Mardell recommended that Mike work with the Practice Development Board to develop the first proposed plan for the Admin Board to consider. This proposal was accepted.</p> <p>In Nov 2008, Casey has an Undoing Racism workshop in Boise. They have dedicated five slots for Idaho leadership to participate in order to understand how to have this conversation. They can bring workshops again at another time in 2009. The People’s Institute conducts it. This training activity is written into the CFS Program’s IV-E/B training plan.</p> | |
| <p>2:45 Break</p> | | |
| <p>Operations Board- Continued Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Workforce Advocacy in Media –Kathy T. ▪ CFSR Update - Group ▪ Report of Accomplishments and Challenges – Mardell | <p>As a result of Open Space planning at the Partnership annual meeting, Kathy Tidwell wrote an editorial on the workload needs of CFS, which led to a TV and in-depth newspaper interview. This activity contributed to the legislative support for granting the eighteen new positions.</p> <p>CSFR Update- It was agreed to wait for July to do this after the PIP stakeholder meeting has occurred, which is scheduled for June5. Some CSFR</p> | <p>Answer the “So What,” i.e., show results in and Outcome column for the Accomplishment/Challenge Report</p> <p>Prioritize the Challenges in the Accomplishment/ Challenge</p> |

- Agenda Items for Next Meeting
- Negotiate Meeting Calendar for 2008

highlights were: Some of the reviewers saw heroic efforts by staff to work at engage families and implement family centered practices.

Regarding the workforce capacities, surprisingly neither the staff nor the federal reviewers indicate that they were overworked or the system was having workload capacity problems.

Stakeholder interviews sent a mixed message. They were unanimous on the dissatisfaction on the general service array available in Kootenai county (mostly adult services (e.g. Substance Abuse, homeless services), yet they indicated internally provided services to children were terrific. In Jerome the reviewers were very impressed with the general array of services available, however noted they were not culturally appropriate. This was echoed in Kootenai County that there were no culturally appropriate services.

The Accomplishments and Challenges were distributed as the first means of reporting to the Admin Board. It was suggested to have this report answer the, “So What” statement by showing what resulted in the accomplishment. There can be an Outcome column for this. The challenge can be aligned with accomplishment with an outcome that has a narrow focus. Another suggestion is prioritizing the challenges. The format for reporting will be on next meeting’s agenda.

The flow of work is that when a board can’t address something, it works with the Operations Board. If the Operations Board cannot work through the challenge, it goes to the Admin Board. The Admin Board then tries to help address the challenge or put the focus in a different direction. The Admin Board can also ask an action board, “What do you need?” A suggestion is that some Admin Board members show up at various action board meetings and provide some consultation.

The plans for the next meeting were discussed, which included the following:

- Invite all university partners to be in attendance to discuss their involvement and the student research,
- Disproportionality
- CMH do an update on their system look like
- CSFR and PIP
- IV-E Funding
- Don Schmid Update
- Accomplishment Challenge Report Format
- November 18th, Board Mtg, November 19, 20 for Annual Meeting
- Communications Input.
- July 23 or 24th for the next meeting coinciding with the BSU Conference
- BSU for next Meeting Location
- Continue using the third week in May 2009 for Admin Board Meetings

Report