



**Scholars Board  
7/09/08**

Agenda Items	Time	Name	Decisions/Notes
Introductions & Brief Announcements			Present: Mardell Nelson, Raymond Mullenax, Mary Jo Murdie, Kathy Tidwell, Robert Hernandez, Roxanne Printz, Eleanor Downey, Bri Watkins, Mark Schultz and Christelle Edmo.  Absent: Kris Richards, Jeremy Player, Randy Rodriquez, Mary Curran, Lawanna Lancaster, Patty Gregory
Minutes Approval and Review Agenda			Logic Model approved
			<b>Welcome to Christelle Edmo, Tribal Relations Program Manager with the Idaho Department of Health &amp; Welfare Division of Family and Community Services, as a new member of the Scholars Board.</b>
<u>Work Updates:</u> *HR	Bri		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Volunteer application: Due date for this work is July 16<sup>th</sup> and will be submitted to HR for review.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the policy on Department Education Leave?</li> </ul>	Bri		<p>Bri will send draft to Scholars Board for review. This document will outline the steps involved in the volunteer application: Self declaration driving form, Criminal History/Background check, and child abuse registry. Each program/regions will have the responsibility of implementing the volunteer application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DHW policy on educational leave was reviewed by Scholars Board. Basically, Program Managers can support employees to return to school and have the support of policy; however, workload concerns will continue to be a large part of this consideration and Program Managers will have to make decisions based upon workload and capacity issues.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Policy &amp; Procedure Issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timeframe for students to pass exams</li> </ul>	Mardell		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A couple students have taken their licensing exams and not passed and the question posed is what timeframe is fair to give students in order to successfully pass their licensing test before they are considered in default? If a student fails the first test they can expedite the test taking up to two additional times. This requires an employer signature showing the student/worker has a job waiting for them contingent upon licensing. Without this process students would</li> </ul>

			<p>need to wait 90 days. Once a student has taken the exam three times (including two expedites) they must wait to retake the exam 90 days.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It is important to balance out expectations for students and definite timelines when they should be ready for employment with that of supporting students and seeing them as investments in Idaho's Child Welfare. The Board agreed that a process should be put in place that considers decision making points along the way. Consensus was achieved to reflect: and expectation that students be licensed within 45 days of graduating. (This is a change from the previous expectations of 30 days post graduation, which has not been a realistic timeframe). How they achieve this is up to them—meaning, if they have to take the test 3 times then they have to take the test three times. At 45 days, if students have not passed their exam they will be turned over for collection. An exception to this policy would be that the Scholars Coordinator or Program Manager discusses with the Scholars Board reasons why collection should not occur. This gives some flexibility to the program in that program managers may want to keep the student as a part-time PSR worker until they can be hired as a full-time, classified social worker. It also gives the Scholars Coordinator the opportunity to give context to the Board about</li></ul>
--	--	--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student issue regarding being in FOCUS database versus child abuse registry and being denied placement. What is process?</li> </ul>			<p>a student's situation (e.g., English as a Second Language). Exceptions will not be the norm and so compelling reasons would need to exist to support not collecting on a student who does not get licensed in the 45 days.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additionally, Scholar Coordinators could continue to use the current policy of encouraging students to take their licensing exam prior to graduation and this will greatly benefit students, should they not pass the first time and need to retake the exam.</li> <li>• This discussion raised the question about how the universities/colleges support students throughout the licensing process.</li> <li>• Current Scholars student was placed in Region for internship. Upon completion of a FOCUS check it was learned she had previous I&amp;R presenting issues. However, these are not substantiated and she passed her background check and is not on the State of Idaho Child Abuse Registry. She has never been formally charged with any crimes, nor did DHW investigate the issue due to it being a third party referral. She was denied placement in the particular region and University was not</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

			<p>informed about specifics. Situation was handled by Mardell who contacted the university student to inform that placement was not an option in the particular region and why. She also outlined a process for the student to take the issue to Michelle Britton. However, there exists no formal process at IDHW to address this type of concern. This raises many ethical questions about treatment of students, due process, constitutional rights, safety of clients, relationships between various partners and the lack of any formal process to address complex issues that arise. It also raises questions around HIPPA and "need to know" basis on information and should universities be informed, or not? In this case the university was informed about some of the allegations, but not specifics. It also raises questions on how FOCUS data is used in decision making around placements and are students fully informed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conclusion is that there is much to be learned from this example. At this time, the Board will wait to see how this situation is resolved; as the student has requested Michelle Britton address her concerns. The Board will address policy concerns upon the resolution of the current example and will address the issue at the next Board meeting.</li> </ul>
<p><u>New Ideas/Work</u></p>			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logic Model: Next Steps</li> </ul>	<p>Ray/All</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open discussion on how to continue to move the Logic Model work forward and develop ways to utilize the model at monthly meetings. One suggestion is to address each focus area as an actual agenda item and then an update on activities could be completed at each meeting. We will also need to add a section for other agenda items that don't necessarily get captured in the Logic Model. Board is comfortable with the Logic Model changing/evolving to address current issues that require attention. Ray will work on developing a format that will be user friendly and relevant to the Board meetings.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LCSW Supervision and work contract obligation (suggestion by Michelle and program managers). Seeking interest from Scholar Board Members to volunteer to work in a work group to address this issue.</li> </ul>	<p>*Mardell</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work group has met once and has call scheduled for next week. There are several complicated issues that surfaced in the past conversation and this work group is trying to clarify. The work group has assigned tasks and will continue to move forward and will update the Scholars Board at a later time. Marian Woods has been added to the group.</li> </ul>



			<p>of the expectations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next step will be to meet with Behavioral Health managers to review Affiliation Agreements. However, some of the regions have limited access to Master Level students for Children's Mental Health and this will need to be prioritized accordingly. Some regions were invited to the previous meetings with CFS program managers and did not show up.</li> </ul>
<i>Next meeting &amp; Agenda</i>	<i>All</i>		<p><i>August 13, 2008 10:00 AM (MDT) to 12:00 (MDT)</i></p> <p><b>CONFERENCE ACCESS INFORMATION:</b> -----</p> <p><b>* Int'l Access/Caller Paid Dial In Number: (505)242-2420</b></p> <p><b>* PARTICIPANT CODE: 409115</b></p> <p><b>Next Meeting: Agenda Ideas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Decision regarding Scholars student and FOCUS information. What can be learned from this process?</b></li> </ul>