

MINUTES

Braam Oversight Panel
Red Lion, Rainier Room
SeaTac, WA
December 6, 2010

Panel Members: John Landsverk (Chair), Jan McCarthy, Jeanine Long, Jess McDonald
Dorothy Roberts

Panel staff: Carrie Whitaker Hennen

Plaintiffs' Attorneys: Casey Trupin, Erin Shea McCann, Bill Grimm, Tim Farris

Attorney General's Office: Steve Hassett, Carrie Wayno

DSHS Staff: Denise Revels Robinson, Elizabeth Jones, Becky Smith, Jeanne McShane,
Rich Pannkuk, Barb Geiger, Ken Nichols, Myra Casey, Randy Hart, and Mark Nelson.

Others: Terry Price, Beth Canfield, Jamie Beletz

Note: The minutes are a general summary of discussion and do not attempt to document every comment. The minutes are supplemented by the attached materials and handouts used during the meeting.

Introduction

John Landsverk called the meeting to order at 1:05pm. He noted that after this meeting, there are two more Braam meetings scheduled—a one-day meeting on March 14, 2011 in Olympia, and a meeting on June 6-7, 2011 in SeaTac. John also noted that the Department has recently provided to the Panel draft FY10 data for most Braam outcomes. These data are embargoed until the final report is issued on January 1, 2011. The Panel will use these data to assess compliance with FY10 Braam benchmarks in its next monitoring report, which will be issued prior to the March meeting.

Updates from Denise Revels Robinson

Denise introduced CA staff members in attendance.

Budget

Denise asked Rich Pannkuk, Director of Finance and Operations, to provide an update on the budget.

Rich provided an overview of the budget, including recent budget cuts. He stated that CA's general fund state appropriation for SFY11 as passed by the Legislature during the 2010 Legislative session was \$306.9 million. This represents a decrease from \$343 million in SFY07-09.

However, Rich explained that after the 2010 Legislative session had ended, the budget picture worsened. A revenue forecast was released in September 2010, which showed a further decline in revenue of \$770 million for FY09-11 and \$669 million for FY11-13. At this time, the Governor had two choices: require across-the-board cuts to all state agencies or call a special session of the Legislature to pass a new budget. The Governor was required to implement across-the-board cuts, requiring every state agency to cut 6.287% of its budget. CA's reductions included cuts to all budget proviso items as well

as additional reductions in areas such as transportation and private agency fees, the addition of more temporary layoff days and the extension of temporary layoffs to direct service staff. Rich clarified for the Panel that a budget proviso is similar to an earmark. He noted that some reductions had to be done strategically—for example, cuts to family support services could not be so large that the state failed to meet federal maintenance of effort requirements and risk losing Title IVB federal funding.

Rich explained that, after implementation of the 6.287% across-the-board cuts, the state received more bad news about the budget. In November 2010, a revenue forecast projected a \$385 million decrease in revenue for 2009-11, and a \$809 million decrease for 2011-2013. Again, in response to the November revenue forecast, the Governor may call a special session of the Legislature or she may implement across-the-board cuts. At the time of the Braam Oversight Panel quarterly meeting, no decision had been made. However, in anticipation of the need to implement further budget cuts, the Department has developed proposals for additional reductions for the current fiscal year as well as a 10% reduction for the next biennium.

Rich noted that, based on the November revenue forecast, CA's general fund-state appropriation could decrease to \$242.7 million in the next biennium. This represents a decrease of \$100 million from the 2007-2009 biennium.

Rich noted that federal Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) funding will also be decreasing. TANF funds have supported direct service staff. The loss of funding in this area could result in a cut of approximately 93 staff positions.

Dorothy Roberts observed that the cuts totaling about \$100 million over the past couple of years represent a staggering 1/3 of the total budget. Rich agreed. He clarified that of that figure, \$55 million in reduction has already taken place, while the remainder is a projection based on the revenue forecasts. The exact amount of cuts for CA is still unknown and will depend on the action taken by the Legislature and the Governor.

Jan McCarthy asked whether any of the reductions relate to foster parents' reimbursement for children in different levels of service. Rich confirmed that this is one of the proposed reductions that has not yet been implemented. Rich also explained that CA is making every effort to be as strategic as possible in addressing the budget issues. For example, CA has implemented several strategic initiatives including accelerating permanency whenever possible and identifying children who are eligible for SSI in order to draw down more federal funding.

John Landsverk asked what constraints the Legislature and/ or Governor face with respect to increasing taxes. Steve Hassett reminded the Panel that Washington state has no income tax. He also updated the group on the results of three initiatives relevant to revenue that were on the ballot in the November 2010 election. Voters approved an initiative requiring a 2/3 supermajority requirement for the Legislature to increase taxes, making it very difficult for this to occur. In addition, voters rejected a proposed income tax that would have applied to high wage earners. Finally, voters passed an initiative repealing a tax instituted during the last legislative session on candy, bottled water and soda. Taken together, these initiatives make tax reform unlikely. Steve noted that this is

particularly challenging in a time when each revenue forecast brings worse news than the one before. He also reminded the group that enhanced federal funding that had been provided through the stimulus plan would be drying up.

Jan McCarthy agreed that this is a terribly painful time for the budget, and she agreed with Rich that it is important to be strategic about budget cuts in order to minimize harm. She asked whether Denise felt that any of these cuts would leave the Department unable to meet its commitments under the Braam Settlement Agreement, including strategies included in compliance plans. For example, she noted that cuts to transportation had been mentioned, and she asked whether this would have an impact foster parents' ability to coordinate sibling visits.

Denise agreed that there are no good options in making these huge budget cuts. She said that this process has required the Department to focus on its core functions of ensuring child safety. She acknowledged that it's not possible to say that the Department is doing more with less- unfortunately, this is a case of doing less with less. That said, Denise indicated that at this point the Department is prepared to continue to meet its commitments under the Braam Settlement Agreement. She left open the possibility that the Department may need to come back to the Panel with adjustments to compliance plans in the future if the budget picture continues to worsen.

Steve Hassett stated that he is hopeful that the practice improvements related to process will continue, even as some resources are eliminated. For example, he noted that staff is now much more aware of the importance of placing siblings together and visiting children in care each month.

Bill Grimm asked whether these deep budget cuts require the Department to notify the federal government that it may be unable to comply with federal mandates. Denise indicated that she was not aware of any changes that would require consultation with the federal government. Steve Hassett noted that the Department would work closely with its federal partners in developing the Program Improvement Plan in response to the recent Child and Family Services Review (CFSR), and that there would be ongoing reporting to the federal government through that process. Denise noted that the Department is working hard to maximize its ability to claim every possible federal dollar and try to secure philanthropic and private funding whenever feasible.

Casey Trupin stated that plaintiffs' attorneys are very concerned about the possible impact of the budget cuts on the progress that has been made under Braam. He agreed with Steve Hassett that much of the progress on Braam outcomes results from practice improvements that do not necessarily require dedicated funding streams. However, he noted that plaintiffs have concerns about huge cuts to foster care maintenance payments, behavioral rehabilitation services, HOPE beds, transportation, and private agency fees. He pointed out that temporary layoffs for direct service staff seem likely to negatively impact monthly visit rates. Casey noted that plaintiffs' counsel will be raising these concerns with the Legislature, the Department and the Governor.

Bill Grimm asked for clarification related to temporary layoffs. Rich noted that SB6503 had required administrative staff to take 10 temporary layoff days during FY11. In a

further cost cutting measure in response to the September revenue forecast, DSHS had extended temporary layoffs to direct service staff (eight days during FY11), and added two additional layoff days for administrative staff (for a total of 12 days during FY11). Jeanine asked whether there was any flexibility in when staff take these temporary layoff days. Denise replied that the legislation had identified specific dates for the original 10 layoff days, but that there is some flexibility for the additional two days in November and May. Denise noted that the arrangement for social workers and supervisors is governed by an agreement reached with the union, and she noted that CA had forwarded this information to the Panel previously (available at <http://wfseunionnew.unionactive.com/docs/DSHS.FURLOUGH.MOU-2010%20with%20addendum.pdf>).

Steve Hassett stated that November 2010 was the first month social workers were subject to temporary layoffs, and said that it will be important to look at monthly visit data for that month to ensure that this does not result in a decrease in visit rates. Denise noted that as part of this process, the Department is looking at all staff workload requirements to heighten the focus on core functions and reduce duplication. For example, she said that CA is looking into the possibility of reducing the number of meetings and staffings.

John Landsverk asked whether CHET Screening Specialists were considered direct service staff or administrative staff. Steve indicated they are classified as direct service staff (social workers) and are therefore subject to 8 furlough days during FY11.

Rich noted that his presentation would end on a more positive note with an update about the recent on-site federal Title IVE Review. He reported that the Department was found to be in substantial compliance on 79 of 80 cases and the status of the one case is pending as CA is waiting to receive information from another state. Jess McDonald commended the Department, stating that this is no small feat. Denise agreed that it is an outstanding accomplishment. Bill Grimm asked for clarification on the nature of the review. Jess explained that it is a very thorough audit, examining all records in a case. A single late service plan could result in a case being rated out of compliance. Denise added that the review examines the eligibility of the child for IVE purposes, and also examines very technical and specific details about court orders. Steve Hassett noted that the federal reviewers were very impressed with the format of Washington's court orders and said they would be useful as a model for other states.

Denise moved on to other updates, and called the group's attention to the handout titled "Updates by Denise Revels Robinson, Children's Administration" (http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesDec10_CAUupdates.pdf).

HB 2106/ Performance-Based Contracting

Denise noted that on November 22, the Department released a draft Request for Proposals (RFP) for master contractors to provide services in six regions. She said that the Department would be accepting public comment and feedback until December 8, 2010. She noted that the final RFP would be issued in January 2011, and respondents will have 8-10 weeks to develop proposals. She stated that this phase of the

procurement process is handled by the contracts division of DSHS. Denise noted that the next meeting of the Transformation Design Committee would be on December 14, 2010.

Denise also reported the Department would be working with Fred Wulczyn from Chapin Hall on financial modeling for the performance-based contracting process.

Jess McDonald commented that the draft RFP is laid out nicely and describes the system very well. He observed that the RFP is very specific about CA and master contractor (MC) responsibilities, but that it does not mention who is responsible for the initial health screen. Denise replied that there will be no change in that area, and CA will still maintain responsibility.

Jess also asked about who is responsible for the service plan. He noted that CA must approve the plan, but the MC facilitates its development. He wondered who would be accountable for whether the plan is implemented. Denise said that this issue has been the topic of a lot of discussion. She replied that the initial service plan developed with new families is the responsibility of CA, and it must be based on the family assessment done by the CPS worker. Ongoing service planning will occur through family team meetings.

Jess said that he understood from the RFP that both the CA worker and the MC worker are to have monthly contacts with children. He noted that in systems in which two sets of staff visit families on a regular basis, there can be confusion and communication problems. Denise replied that in Phase 1 of this process, case management remains with CA and visits with children remain a CA requirement. However, for certain services, there are requirements for private agencies around contact with children.

Other

Denise noted that Washington State held events across the state for National Adoption Day in November. Secretary Susan Dreyfus and Denise each went to adoption events in two counties. Denise reported that over 1500 adoptions were finalized during FY10.

Denise reported that the National Governor's Association selected Washington to host a "learning lab" last month, November 2010. Several states participated in discussions related to educational achievement, supporting older youth in foster care, and transitioning youth out of care. She reported that a panel of older youth in foster care had been one of the highlights.

In addition, in early December, CA hosted a visit from Joyce James, a national expert on racial disproportionality from Texas. Joyce has worked extensively with Casey Family Programs, who funded her visit. The visit was a partnership between CA and the Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration. Denise reported they had appreciated the opportunity to learn from the success that Texas has had in reducing racial disproportionality and to engage in discussion about how to take the work of the Racial Disproportionality Advisory Committee (RDAC) to the next level. Joyce will do some follow up consulting with CA in the future.

Dorothy Roberts asked whether the follow up would include any written report or documents that could be shared. Denise said that CA would share any information that is put together during this process, and she would ensure that the RDAC's amended plan is shared with the Panel.

Initial Health Screens

Denise reminded the group that at the September 2010 Braam Oversight Panel quarterly public meeting, CA stated it would implement policy requiring Initial Health Screens within 5 days of entry into foster care in October 2010. She reported that the policy had in fact been implemented on October 31, and staff received training during October. Denise noted that a preliminary FamLink report has been developed and is being validated. She also reported that the Caregiver Connection newsletter included information on Initial Health Screens, and reminded the Panel of the letter she sent to providers about Initial Health Screenings previously shared with the Panel. Denise stated that she hoped MaryAnne Lindeblad, the new Assistant Secretary for the Aging and Disability Services Administration, would be able to attend the March Braam Oversight Panel meeting to provide an update on the Fostering Well-Being program,.

Barb Geiger highlighted work being done to build capacity for Initial Health Screens in Region 5. She reported that the region is partnering with the nursing program at Olympic College. Through this partnership, established nurses in the community are working with Region 5 to build a network of providers willing to conduct Initial Health Screens.

Jan McCarthy asked when data would become available from the FamLink report. Elizabeth Jones replied that regions are reviewing the report and have found discrepancies, so more work needs to be done to improve accuracy. In addition, there is not yet a way to account for exceptions to children having an Initial Health Screen (such as children placed into out of home care directly from a hospital or receiving services from a Child Advocacy Center, for example). Elizabeth said that it could be a while before reliable data are available.

Informational Data on Selected Braam Outcomes

Elizabeth noted that CA would present informational data on the Braam outcomes for which the Panel and the Department had agreed that the Department would submit more frequent data. She said that the presentation would begin with the monthly reports and would then move on to the quarterly reports. She noted that CA would present data for all of the outcomes for which monthly or quarterly data is required, and that Regional Administrators would discuss a subset of those outcomes previously agreed to in advance with the Braam Oversight Panel.

Monthly Reports

Data for Braam outcomes for which data are provided on a monthly basis are available in the handout entitled "Monthly Informational Performance Reports" (http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesDec10_Monthlydata.pdf).

Caseload Size

Elizabeth noted there has been a small amount of progress on the caseload size measure, with 75.5% of social workers serving at least one child in out of home care having caseloads of 18 or fewer in November 2010. She stated the Department continues to work on the new report developed by CA to validate and ensure its accuracy.

Monthly Visits

Elizabeth reported that 90% of children requiring a monthly visit were visited in September 2010. This represents a significant increase in performance over the past year, although performance has been fairly level over the past few months.

Ken Nichols, Regional Administrator in Region 2, reported that the monthly visit report was recently revised and resulted in 1,200 more children requiring visits being added to the report population. The primary impact of the change is to better account for children in trial return home status. He noted that there are still times when social workers do not complete visits, and he reported that there has been a lot of illness in his region resulting in visiting being canceled. He also noted that there are still instances in which visits have occurred but were coded incorrectly, and some delays in social workers entering data into FamLink.

Randy Hart, Regional Administrator in Region 3, said that managers continue to address documentation errors and there are far fewer of these than there were a year ago. In addition, managers are always looking at missed visits to ensure that children for whom a visit is missed are seen as soon as possible. He noted that there is accountability at all levels, and there is great buy-in for making sure kids are safe.

John Landsverk asked for more information on how regions track children for whom a visit is missed to make sure they are seen immediately. Randy replied that area managers continually follow up with staff on this subject. In addition, in his region, there is a staff person responsible for tracking these children and sending reports to offices to ensure that children are seen immediately. Ken Nichols stated that the system in his region is similar, with a spreadsheet disseminated to local offices listing children for whom visits have been missed so that follow up becomes a priority. He said that this is not so much on account of a commitment to Braam; more importantly, it is a commitment to children and families.

Casey Trupin asked about courtesy visits, meaning visits by social workers from a region in which a child from another region is placed. Elizabeth Jones replied that she had conducted a random review of visits coded as "Visit Conducted by Other Agency," which showed that many of these visits are Interstate Compact for the Placement of Children (ICPC) visits conducted by social workers in receiving states or visits conducted by the CA social worker or courtesy supervision social worker that were coded inaccurately. This code has not been included in compliance counts for monthly visits in the past, but CA intends to begin counting these as compliant next month as a result of the random review. Casey said that plaintiffs' counsel had heard that the number of courtesy supervision visits has increased because of cuts to the transportation budget, with social workers unable to travel to children placed outside of their regions. Becky Smith replied

that it is CA's policy that children placed outside their home regions should be supervised through courtesy supervision for workload reasons, so that staff do not spend so much time traveling. In addition, this policy means that children are able to build a relationship with a social worker who is nearby in case someone needs to respond immediately, rather than only having a worker from their home region. Becky indicated that this is not a new policy, but CA has placed increasing emphasis on it more recently.

Steve Hassett reported that the Department is reexamining the issue of visits by private agencies as a result of HB2106. He noted that some Panel members have been interested in this issue in the past and have suggested that not counting visits by private agencies may be a missed opportunity. He reminded the group that CA had made a policy decision that the DCFS social worker must conduct the visits. He said that in Elizabeth's random review of "Visits Conducted by Other Agency," most were either Interstate Compact for the Placement of Children (ICPC) visits in receiving states or visits by CA social workers or courtesy visits for children placed out of their own region but within the state that were coded incorrectly. He stated that the Department will begin including these in the compliance counts in future months. In addition, the review found that very few visits by private agencies are documented. As part of the HB2106 process, particularly in Phase 2, the Department may revisit this issue of counting visits by private agencies.

CHET Screens

Barb Geiger, Region 5, reported that CA achieved the 90% benchmark statewide for CHET completion in August 2010. She noted that two regions (regions 2 and 3) completed 100% of CHET screens in 30 days, and there had been significant improvement in Region 5, largely as a result of school personnel returning to work.

Barb noted that medical appointments and records can still be a challenge. She said that regional CHET coordinators received a list of healthcare providers and schools that have not been responding to records requests in a timely way and will be reaching out to them to find ways of working with them more effectively.

Steve Hassett reminded the group that there has been a significant increase in dependency filings, which was discussed at the previous Braam Oversight Panel meeting. He commented that the high level of performance on completing CHET Screens is even more impressive given the significant growth in the number of children entering the system and therefore requiring a CHET Screen. The Department has not only improved performance, it has also kept up with significant growth.

Elizabeth Jones noted that performance in the physical health domain was 91% and the education domain performance increased to 92%. She pointed out there had been significant improvement in the area of education with school staff returning to work. Jeanine Long commented that she was hopeful that there would not be as big a drop in performance next July now that screeners have built stronger relationships with schools in their areas. Elizabeth shared with her that CA was fortunate that relationships were strong enough in some areas that some school staff were willing to come into their

closed offices when they were not getting paid. Schools are facing budget reductions and CA may experience the same challenges next summer.

All of the Panel members commended CA on efforts related to completion of CHET Screens and indicated that they were pleased to see such a high level of performance in this area. Jeanine Long reminded the group that the initial legislation requiring the CHET program was passed about 15 years and said that it is wonderful to finally see the CHET Screen being used consistently. She said that she hoped the Department feels that the information obtained through the CHET Screening process is helpful for children, as that was the Legislature's intent. She stated that the more the Department knows about a child at the time of placement the better, as this will lead to a better placement match and more timely implementation of needed services.

Casey Trupin said that plaintiffs are also extremely pleased to see this progress. He asked why the lines on the charts showing the benchmark did not show a benchmark for FY11. Carrie Hennen replied that the Implementation Plan does not include benchmarks for FY11. John Landsverk stated that the FY10 benchmarks are the final annual benchmarks, although there will be ongoing monthly and quarterly reporting on selected outcomes.

Early Support for Infant and Toddlers

Elizabeth Jones reported that performance on the outcome related to timely referral to early intervention services for children identified as having a concern for potential development delay from the CHET Screen was 100% during the month of August. August was the first month CA achieved 100% compliance. Performance on this outcome has consistently met the 90% benchmark since April 2010.

CHET Shared Planning Meetings

Ken Nichols reported that performance on conducting CHET shared planning meetings within 60 days of entry to care was 75% in August 2010. Performance has steadily improved over the past year. He stated that the management report that was developed to identify specific children for whom a meeting has not yet been held has been extremely helpful.

Randy Hart stated that his region continues to use monthly reports and work with staff to improve performance in this area. He indicated that a recent update to the Shared Planning meeting pages in FamLink included several changes to improve the quality of documentation and the accuracy with which these meetings are included in the performance management report.

Jess McDonald asked for clarification about supervisory expectations. He asked whether formal one-on-one supervision is occurring and he stated that this should be an opportunity for supervisors to work with staff to find out whether visits have been made and required meetings held, and to plan for how these things will be accomplished if they have not been done. Randy Hart replied that since most staff complete monthly visits over 95% of the time, this type of supervision is generally only needed with staff who have not consistently completed their visits. Randy said that supervision usually

focuses more on the quality of visits and meetings, and on case planning. Supervisors do have expectations to ensure these staffings occur.

Transition (Exit) Staffings for Youth Leaving Foster Care

Elizabeth Jones reported that performance on this outcome remains quite low and far short of the benchmark (30% in September 2010). She said that a list was recently developed and will be managed on a monthly basis showing youth who will be turning 17.5 as part of a new quality assurance plan. She was hopeful that the monthly data would be trending upward by the next Braam Oversight Panel meeting.

John Landsverk noted that a small number of children are affected by this outcome, about 40 per month. Jess McDonald pointed out that this could include some youth who are on runaway status. He noted that if a staffing is not occurring, it is problematic. These meetings provide an opportunity to talk with aging out youth about benefits they may qualify for when they exit care, and it is critical that this discussion takes place. He said that since there is such a small number of youth, it would be useful if CA could report at the next meeting on youth for whom this meeting did not take place and why.

Steve Hassett pointed out that under current state law, youth age out at 18, but they have the ability to sign themselves back into care in order to complete high school. He wondered whether there may be some youth whose workers know they will be staying in care and therefore do not have staffings.

Elizabeth Jones shared it is CA's practice expectation that staffings occur prior to a youth turning 17.6 years of age regardless of the long-term plan and the QA tracking system does require regions to document reasons staffings do not occur. CA anticipates that this will help performance improve and provide additional information to understand reasons meetings are not occurring which can be shared at the next Panel meeting.

Bill Grimm asked whether staff are well-trained to deal with transition issues and services for aging out youth. Steve replied that many adolescents are served in specialized units. Jess noted that it would be interesting to see whether there is a difference in performance between specialized units and mixed caseloads. It was noted that due to the small number of youth that level of analysis would be difficult.

The group discussed why performance on this outcome has not improved. Myra Casey noted that her region had only recently begun to focus on this issue. Steve Hassett agreed, noting that the Department had prioritized systemic issues impacting all children such as monthly visits, and only recently began emphasizing this kind of issue. He noted that the most recent data available are for September 2010, which is the month in which several new strategies (such as FamLink email notices to social workers serving youth turning 17) were implemented to improve performance. The group agreed that it would be interesting to discuss this subject at the March 2011 Braam Oversight Panel meeting to see whether these strategies have resulted in improvement.

Jan McCarthy asked whether staff find these transition meetings to be useful. The regional administrators agreed that they do, but said that in the past there has been a

lack of strategic focus in this area and a failure to document meetings that do take place.

Youth on Runaway Status

Ken Nichols reported that 77 youth were on runaway status at the end of October. He reported that for 22% of these youth, this was their first running event. Conversely, 35% of these youth had more than 6 runaway events.

With respect to where youth were placed at the time they ran away, 38% were placed in group care, 34% in foster care, 16% in relatives, 3% in crisis residential centers, and 3% in other settings.

John Landsverk asked whether there is seasonality to runaway trends, with more runaway events during better weather. Steve Hassett agreed that the annual data suggest that this is the case.

Jeanine Long asked how the Department intervenes with youth at the time of their first running event. Ken replied that there are protocols in terms of reporting and attempting to locate and stabilize these youth, and there is also an effort to find out why the youth ran away and where they went. Jeanine asked whether the Department keeps track of what happens to the youth after CA's intervention in order to determine what interventions are effective in preventing subsequent running behavior. Ken replied that this is not tracked in FamLink; however, at the local level, staff tend to know these youth and are aware of what will work with an individual youth. Jess McDonald asked whether there is any evidence that youth are running because of abuse in their placement setting. Becky Smith replied that the Department does need to look at that issue. She noted that staffing meetings are held when youth run away, and that the Department needs to take that opportunity to learn more from youth about why they run away.

Elizabeth noted that there is a quality assurance process on a monthly basis to track and manage issues related to youth on runaway status. She also reminded the group that CA is looking into factors that might be attributed to racial disproportionality for this outcome and additional analysis will continue for this small population of youth in out of home care.

Tim Farris asked for more information as to why youth run away. Ken Nichols replied that there may be issues related to gang affiliation and involvement with drugs and alcohol. Tim asked whether there is any correlation between runaway activity and the quality of the foster home the youth is running away from. Ken replied that he suspected there is, but that kind of assessments is not done. Elizabeth shared that regional QA leads for youth on runaway status discussed reasons youth are on running and reviewed notes and reached out to social workers and some of the reasons were youth not wanting to follow rules, youth having untreated substance abuse and mental health issues, youth wanting to reside with families or friends that do not meet CA standards to be a placement resource.

Quarterly Reports

Data for Braam outcomes for which data are provided on a monthly basis are available in the handout entitled "Quarterly Informational Performance Reports" (http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesDec10_Quarterlydata.pdf).

Elizabeth Jones noted that no new data had become available since the September Braam Panel meeting for the DLR/ CPS outcome or the outcome related to health and education plans in the ISSP.

Adequate Safeguards for Sexually Aggressive Youth

Elizabeth reported that performance on the SAY outcome for the first three quarters of FY10 was 72.9%, up a few percentage points from 70.3% in FY09. The SAY outcome looks at foster parent training and safety plans.

Adequate Safeguards for Physically Assaultive/ Aggressive Youth

Elizabeth noted that significant improvement has been shown in the area of PAAY. Performance on this outcome has increased from 52.9% in FY09 to 74.5% for the first three quarters of FY10. Data for this measure was corrected for Quarter 2 after WSU found an error in their calculation. The PAAY outcome looks at foster parent training and safety plans.

Foster Parent Support

Jeanne McShane of the Division of Licensed Resources (DLR) presented data on the foster parent support outcome, noting that there has been relatively little change since CY07. Performance for the first three quarters of FY10 was 76.8%. The foster parent support outcome is based on foster parent responses to survey questions about support from the agency, support from social workers, support in crises, support on issues of cultural competence and notification about case planning meetings and hearings.

Jeanne also noted that the Panel had previously asked whether there was any difference in foster parents' responses to the survey questions related to how well supported they feel based on the length of time the foster parent has served or the number of children placed in their home. She said that CA had worked with John Tarnai of Washington State University to analyze this question for the survey items related to how foster parents feel about support by the agency and support by their social worker. John Tarnai indicated there were no statistically significant differences. Jeanne noted the sample set he used was fairly small, just one quarter, and we will be taking a look at this again with the full fiscal year data that will be used for the annual report.

Jeanne reported on efforts to improve support to foster parents and caregivers, including expansion of hubs and support groups, ongoing collaboration through HB1624 meetings, increased communication through the website and monthly newsletter, random staff calls to check in with foster parents, trainings with social workers and supervisors that address relationship building with foster parents, and trainings that are attended jointly by foster parents and social workers. She reported that a workgroup has drafted a Statewide Caregiver Support Plan, which is currently under review by the CA Leadership Team and will then be shared with the Foster Parent Association of Washington State (FPAWS) and others for feedback.

Jess McDonald asked whether CA would be looking at the issue of foster parent support by master contractors through the performance-based contracting process. Denise indicated that the RFP for master contractors addresses applicable Braam Settlement Agreement requirements.

Casey Trupin noted that the foster parent support outcome includes several different foster parent survey questions, and he stated that it would be useful to look at data for each of these individual questions over the past several years to see whether there are different trends for these questions. He said that plaintiffs do not agree that performance on this measure has been stuck, noting that performance dropped four percentage points between CY08 and FY09 and has increased by five percentage points since then.

John Landsverk remarked that he believes this is not a very sensitive measure, and that it is difficult to change performance on this type of measure when data are based on survey responses.

Beth Canfield of FPAWS commented that she believes that if the questions on the survey were different and more recent, performance on this outcome might be worse. She said that while many foster parents have good relationships with their social workers, FPAWS receives complaints related to other issues that may not be captured in the survey questions. For example, she said that FPAWS receives a lot of complaints and concerns about cuts that have come as a result of the budget—reductions in rates, cuts to clothing vouchers, and cuts to transportation. She said that the level of stress in the foster parent community is very high. Elizabeth Jones shared that the survey results are recent as the information is based on interviews conducted with foster parents and caregivers in September and October of this year.

Beth asked whether there was any possibility of changing some of the wording in the foster parent survey questions. Elizabeth replied that Denise has suggested that CA reexamine the entire foster parent survey to determine how it can be most useful. John Landsverk pointed out that, given that the scheduled end of the Braam agreement is next summer, it does not make sense to make major changes during the next few months.

Jeanine Long asked Denise for clarification on her statement that Braam requirements will be incorporated in the performance-based contracts with master contractors. She asked how the budget cuts will affect this process and the expectations of providers. Denise replied that a case rate will be paid to the master contractors, but that it will be several months before CA knows its total appropriation for the next biennium. CA has included its expectations of master contractors in the RFP, but recognizes that there may be a need to make adjustments based on total funding available. Jeanine asked whether CA would narrow the requirements of master contractors to focus on core functions if CA does not receive adequate funding to require contractors to meet all Braam Settlement Agreement expectations. Denise replied that many of the Braam requirements will remain CA's responsibility, so the issue of expectations for master contractors is not entirely relevant and will be reviewed as they are applicable.

Jeanine noted that one of the documents related to the budget showed cuts in a number of areas related to foster parents, including 100% reductions to line items such as foster parent support and foster care support goods/ services. Denise clarified that these are proposed reductions and whether they are implemented depends on the budget passed by the Legislature. She noted that in areas in which CA had proposed 100% reductions, they believe that there would be other more cost-effective ways to provide these services. She noted that CA is looking at training differently in order to provide better support to foster parents by offering more, higher quality training on contemporary issues.

Jess McDonald referred to data from the DLR/ CPS outcome and pointed out that there were about 860 investigations of allegations of abuse/ neglect in foster homes and licensed facilities during the previous year. He asked what percent of those were indicated. Jeanne McShane replied that there were indicated reports for 32 children in placement, a very small percentage of the investigations. Jess noted that the investigation process is usually difficult and contentious, and foster parents going through this process would be likely to report dissatisfaction with the agency. Jeanne agreed. Beth Canfield noted that FPAWS had met with Jeanne and others to try to develop protocols for more respectful investigations of foster parents. She said that some agreements had been reached, but she had heard that these procedures are not consistently followed. She said that unfounded investigations sometimes cause good foster parents to quit because the process is so difficult. Jess stated that, in Illinois, there were "master foster parents" who were available to help guide other foster parents through the investigations process. Beth stated that when DLR and DCFS were split into separate entities, foster parents reported a change in tone toward policing foster parents rather than supporting them.

Denise reported on a meeting she attended during the summer in region 2, which discussed concerns about how allegations against foster parents are handled and the timeliness of these investigations. Ken Nichols reported that this group would be developing recommendations this spring, and he was hopeful these recommendations would be useful statewide.

Steve Hassett returned to the issue of John Tarnai's analysis of satisfaction based on the length of time a respondent had been a foster parent. He said that the data suggested there is a higher satisfaction level for more experienced foster parents who have cared for more children. Elizabeth replied that John Tarnai felt that the analysis was not conclusive. He planned to re-do this analysis at the end of the year, when more data would be available and may allow for more reliable conclusions.

Elizabeth also stated that the next quarterly report would present trend data over time for each question that is part of the foster parent support outcome.

Sibling Visits and Contacts

Elizabeth reported that the proportion of children having visits or contacts with their siblings at least twice monthly was 44.1% during the 3rd quarter of FY10. However, she noted that data on sibling visits and contacts cannot be compared across years, because

the foster parent survey questions on which data for this outcome are based have been modified over time. The foster parent survey currently asks respondents about children's contacts with each of their siblings individually, rather than a general question about all siblings. This was an effort by CA to obtain more detail on the types of sibling relationships. However, Elizabeth noted that the way in which this outcome now looks at each individual sibling relationship is a higher threshold than the language of the Braam outcome, which is focused on visits with "some or all" siblings. Elizabeth shared she is working with John Tarnai at WSU on a possible measure that would be more aligned with the outcome and will be including parties to the Settlement Agreement in the discussion. She is also working with him to display survey results in a more meaningful way to better inform discussion of practice and improvement strategies.

Sibling Placement

Myra Casey reported that the percentage of children placed with all of their siblings in foster care was 64.7% in FY10, which represents a 4 percentage point increase from FY09. She noted that children placed with relatives are more likely to be placed with all of their siblings (78.8% compared to 53.8%).

Myra noted that the percentage of children placed with some or all of their siblings was 81.3% in FY10, very similar to the 80.9% performance in FY09. Again, the percentage of children in relative care placed with some or all siblings is higher than children in non-relative care (89.6% compared with 74.9%).

Myra noted that this is an important outcome, because research shows that children placed with siblings are often more stable and more likely to achieve timely permanency than children who are separated from their siblings. Jeanine Long asked whether the research reached the same findings about placement with half siblings, and Elizabeth replied that the research she reviewed did not differentiate between half and full siblings.

Myra Casey summarized efforts underway to increase the frequency with which siblings are placed together, including Family Team Decision Meetings, expectations in the foster parent recruitment contracts regarding recruitment of homes able to serve sibling groups, policy requirements that placement coordinators make efforts to maintain siblings together and exploring bringing the Neighbor to Family program to Washington. In addition, Myra noted that CA sponsors "Camp to Belong" for siblings in foster care. Elizabeth shared that at the September meeting she agreed to follow up with the video about Camp to Belong and as time permits will show the video during the meeting.

Jess McDonald asked whether CA assigns cases such that sibling groups are on the same caseworker's caseload. Myra replied that this is usually the case, but that there are exceptions. An example might be if one of the children is assigned to a social worker in a specialized adolescent unit.

Elizabeth Jones stated that CA is working on strengthening administrative data that shows relationships among siblings and clarifies issues related to half siblings, etc.

Plaintiffs' Comments

Casey Trupin commented that plaintiffs' attorneys were pleased with the data presented during the session. He noted that, despite comments from the Department in years past, the data now clearly demonstrate that the Braam Settlement Agreement benchmarks are not unattainable. He said that Regional Administrators deserve significant credit for the huge progress in areas such as CHET Screens and monthly visits.

Casey noted that plaintiffs' counsel remain extremely concerned that the budget cuts will mean that this excellent progress is reversed or slowed. He again lauded CA staff for the focus on Braam measures and the resulting progress, and noted that plaintiffs' counsel will be working with the Legislature and the Governor's office to safeguard as much of the CA budget as possible.

Jeanine Long responded to Casey's comments, indicating that she shared his concerns that progress will come undone as a result of budget cuts. She said that she is pleased and proud of how far the Department has come, and that the budget cuts will mean that sustaining this progress will require an even stronger and more sustained focus on these issues.

John Landsverk adjourned the meeting at 5pm.

MINUTES

Braam Oversight Panel
Red Lion, Rainier Room
SeaTac, WA
December 7, 2010

Panel Members: John Landsverk (Chair), Jan McCarthy, Jeanine Long, Jess McDonald
Dorothy Roberts

Panel staff: Carrie Whitaker Hennen

Plaintiffs' Attorneys: Casey Trupin, Erin Shea McCann, Bill Grimm

Attorney General's Office: Steve Hassett, Carrie Wayno

DSHS Staff: Elizabeth Jones, Becky Smith, Jeanne McShane, Ken Nichols, Myra Casey,
Randy Hart, Joel Odimba, Nancy Sutton

Others: Mark Courtney, Fred Wulczyn, Mason Burley, Tessa Keating, Megan Palchak

Presentation on Placement Stability by Partners for Our Children (POC) and Chapin Hall

Mark Courtney and Fred Wulczyn gave a presentation on an analysis of placement stability data in Washington and other states that was conducted by Partners for Our Children (POC) and Chapin Hall. A copy of the presentation entitled "Measuring and Understanding Placement Mobility" is available at http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesDec10_POCPresentation.pdf.

Fred Wulczyn provided an overview of the reason for the study, research questions and methodology (see presentation, slides 1-5). He explained that the key measure used in the study was the average number of moves per child for each six month interval from the time of placement. He noted that this measure was helpful in understanding stability because it automatically adjusts for length of stay. He indicated that, like other research, the data clearly demonstrated that the likelihood of a child moving is highest in the first six months that a child is in out-of-home placement. This pattern is very consistent across states and for children of all ages and races/ ethnicities.

Mark Courtney stated that the intent of the study was to bring new thinking to how placement stability is measured. He said that the analysis had not been as detailed as would be necessary in order to make recommendations about policy and practice, but the measures used were more nuanced than those used for the federal CFSR and the Braam Settlement Agreement. The measure of moves per child per six-month interval adjusts for time in care, can be analyzed to better understand the nature of the movement, and is sensitive to change.

Mark summarized the findings of the analysis. He noted that movement in the first six months was higher in Washington state than in the other states examined, but after the third six-month interval (after the 12-18 month interval), movement in Washington appears to be the same as or lower than other states examined. These trends were shown across all age groups, but were more pronounced for children age 0-4. (see slides 6-8)

Mark discussed a table providing data on types of placement moves (see slide 10). He pointed out that although children in Washington are less likely than children in other states to be placed with relatives for their first placement (23% compared with 28%), a large number of moves in Washington are moves to relative care (20%, compared with 13% in other states). In addition, the data show that youth in Washington are far less likely than those in other states to be initially placed in group care (12% compared to 22% in other states), and there is less movement of youth from one group care placement to another.

Jeanine Long asked for clarification as to why the percentage of children placed with unpaid relatives is so much higher in Washington than in other states (23% compared to 5%). Fred replied that this is a complicated question related to state policy and practice. Some states have been aggressive about getting relatives licensed, while Washington has generally relied on unlicensed relatives. He noted that in this state, unpaid relatives is a bit of a misnomer because these caregivers are usually paid, but they receive a smaller stipend through Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) child-only payments rather than foster care payments. Mark Courtney noted that although the percentage of children who are initially placed with relatives is lower in Washington than in the comparison group of states, the percentage of children in Washington placed with relatives on a point in time basis is about 38%, which is quite high compared with other states.

Steve Hassett inquired about the dates covered by the data. Mark replied that the data ended in 2007, and that he felt it would be useful to update this analysis before using it to guide policy or practice decisions.

Jan McCarthy asked about the way in which the study measured moves, which was based on the number of moves that occurred during each 6 month interval, rather than the number of moves over an extended period of time. For example, she asked how the data would capture the experience of a child who moved once during each 6 month interval and whether there would be a way using these measures to know the total number of moves that child actually experienced. Fred and Mark said that this analysis would not answer that question. Jan commented that the measures used in this study were useful as they helped shed light on when moves occur, by age, by race, and accounting for the type of move rather than simply counting the number of placements. However, she commented that the data should be combined with an understanding of how many total moves individual children experience and what percentage of children experience multiple moves. Mark agreed that this analysis does not address the issue of multiple moves. He said that this question highlights some values questions that systems need to grapple with, such as how many moves is too many and what type of moves, if any, should be considered acceptable moves. For example, he noted that some people in Washington feel that placing a young child in pediatric interim care and then moving them to a foster home is good practice because it provides around the clock nursing care and an opportunity for up-front assessment, while others disagree and feel that this adds an unnecessary move.

Dorothy Roberts commented that this analysis suggests that the number of moves is an oversimplified way to look at the issue of stability. She suggested that while aggregate

data is useful, it might be more revealing to look at individual cases and the reasons for moves. Mark agreed, noting that aggregate data can help identify what type of cases should be reviewed. Fred pointed out that even if one administrative measure is selected for accountability purposes, systems can and should still use other measures to better understand the problem. Mark stated that it is hard to set a standard for an acceptable amount of movement, but that this type of analysis can be helpful in attempting to understand issues related to stability.

Bill Grimm stated that the nuances in terms of timing of moves and the types of moves are important, but he stated that there is still some threshold at which additional moves are simply unacceptable.

John Landsverk said that this is an area of ongoing research. He acknowledged that the Braam Settlement Agreement measure of stability has limitations, noting that it was closely related to the federal CFSR measure with some minor modifications to exclude the first move to relatives, for example. He noted that the measure is fairly crude and is not very sensitive to change. Mark Courtney agreed, and observed that measures of movement that look at six-month intervals would be much more sensitive to change.

Jess McDonald asked Mark and Fred whether they are aware of any jurisdictions in which settlement agreements or consent decrees are in place that are using case reviews or qualitative data to look at the issue of placement stability. Fred replied that he was not aware of any jurisdictions but he agreed that qualitative reviews would be a great supplement to aggregate data.

John Landsverk commented that the end of the settlement agreement is approaching, such that it would not make sense to modify how the Braam process measures placement stability at this time. Still, he acknowledged that it is useful for the parties and the Panel to have other ways of looking at the issue. Casey Trupin noted that if the Braam Settlement Agreement is extended, this type of analysis and alternative approach to this issue will be useful.

Steve Hassett asked what states had been included in the comparison group. Fred Wulczyn replied that Chapin Hall's agreements with the states around the use of these data did not permit him to identify the states.

Becky Smith updated the group on how CA intends to use this analysis. She noted that CA staff had met with Mark and Fred the previous day and discussed possible areas of additional analysis and CA leadership agrees that a good next step would be for the data to be updated, as there have been a number of system and practice changes since 2007. She commented that recent interventions such as improved assessments at the time of entry to care, Family Team Decision Meetings, and stronger support for relative caregivers should lead to improvements in stability.

Joel Odimba agreed that FTDMs are useful in addressing issues of stability. He said it would also be useful to hear the perspective of youth on why they are moved. Joel also noted that it would be helpful to further disaggregate the data to show rates and patterns of movement by race and gender.

Ken Nichols said that in his region, placement coordinators ask social workers why a move is necessary and whether anything can be done to avoid the need to move the child before they find a new placement. In addition, Ken noted that supervisors with more experiences are able to help support foster parents who request that a child be moved, sometimes avoiding the need for the move. Region 2 also has a staff person who is able to do foster parent mediation.

Joel Odimba reported that, around the state, regional administrators must approve a placement move for a child who has been in his/ her current placement for a year or more before they can be moved.

Foster Youth Educational Outcomes, Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP)

Mason Burley of WSIPP presented updated dropout and graduation statistics. Mason's presentation, Foster Youth Educational Outcomes, is available at http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesDec10_WSIPPpresentation.pdf.

Mason provided a brief summary of previous research done by WSIPP on educational outcomes for youth in foster care, which has consistently shown that youth in foster care experience more negative educational outcomes than the general population (slides 1-3).

Mason then presented updated data showing graduation rates for foster youth (slides 4-6). Over the past three years, there has been improvement in foster youth graduation rates. However, foster youth still lag far behind the general population in this area. In addition, for the first time, WSIPP calculated rates for other disadvantaged populations such as special education, limited English proficiency, low income, and migrant students. Graduation rates for foster youth were well below rates for these other groups.

Jess McDonald asked whether it is possible that there are differences in graduation rates by school district, and whether foster students may be more likely to attend school in districts with lower overall graduation rates. Mason replied that this is possible, but that it would be difficult to analyze because of limitations in the data and due to the small numbers of foster youth.

Casey Trupin asked whether it would be possible to analyze graduation rates for homeless youth. Mason replied that these youth had not been identified in the data sets he used. He said that more current data may identify this information, but he was not certain. Casey observed that, although graduation rates for foster youth still lag behind other groups, this was the only population analyzed for which improvement has occurred over the past few years.

Steve Hassett asked whether children who turn 18 years old during their senior year of high school and exit foster care would be shown in the data. Mason replied that they would be included if they had an active placement during the school year.

Jess McDonald asked whether Washington statute includes educational neglect in its definition of neglect. Steve Hassett said that truancy by itself does not constitute neglect, but the courts may consider it along with other factors. Jess pointed out that children with poor educational records may be overrepresented in foster care. John Landsverk agreed, but he noted that it is remarkable that all of the other disadvantaged populations studied show a higher graduation rate than foster youth.

Mason presented data on dropout rates for foster youth in comparison to the general population as well as other disadvantaged groups (see slides 7-8). These data show similar trends to the graduation rates.

Jeanine Long suggested that it would be useful to share this information not only with the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), but also with individual school districts.

Jess McDonald reported that in Illinois, there were reports of school districts encouraging foster youth not to attend school on testing days and not intervening to prevent these youth from dropping out because there was a perception that this population would impact negatively on the school's ratings. Randy Hart stated that some school districts were more supportive of foster youth than others. He said that in his region, large districts with the resources and expertise to work with diverse student populations tended to be more supportive, while some of the mid-size districts were more difficult to work with. Casey Trupin noted that he has worked on a project related to homeless education, and he has also seen variation among districts in their support for disadvantaged student groups. Joel Odimba noted that CA has educational agreements regarding support for foster youth with the majority of school districts, including almost all districts in which foster youth are concentrated.

Mason noted that data on completion of general educational development (GED) are not maintained by OSPI, so he was not able to directly analyze the number of foster youth obtaining GEDs. However, national research suggests that foster youth are more likely to obtain a GED than the rest of the population, at rates of between 5 and 29%. On slide 10, Mason presented data showing estimated graduation rates if GEDs are included. For the 2008-2009 school year, the estimated rates range from 49% (if 5% of foster youth are assumed to earn GEDs) to 73% (if 29% of foster youth earn GEDs). He noted that it is well-established that outcomes for individuals earning high school diplomas are better than for those earning GEDs, but that some research suggests that a GED is preferable to dropping out of high school.

Jeanine Long asked whether there is any data on what happens to the youth who drop out of school and whether they are more likely to end up incarcerated or on public assistance. She pointed out that there could be long-term savings associated with supporting these youth's efforts to graduate from high school.

Jess McDonald asked whether there was information on the type of placement for youth who complete high school compared with those who drop out. He noted that in Illinois, youth placed with relatives were less likely to complete high school. Mason reported that this was not part of his analysis, and that the Treehouse educational advocacy program

might have information on this subject. Jess also pointed out that the CHET process provides a lot of information on students' educational status at the time of entry into care, and this could be useful in case planning.

Jess asked members of the Panel whether they felt that the child welfare system or the schools are more responsible for foster youth's graduation outcomes. There was a range of opinions among the Panel members. John Landsverk noted that educational attainment is closely linked to parental involvement in education and for foster youth, the state is essentially serving a parental role. Jess McDonald replied that being the legal parent is very different from being a child's actual parent.

Juvenile Detention Workgroup

Steve Hassett presented an update on the work of the juvenile detention workgroup (see CA power point presentation, http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesDec10_CApresentation.pdf).

Steve noted that the data analyst who manages King County's detention data attended the most recent meeting of the workgroup, and clarified that the reason the length of stay in detention appeared to be so much longer in King County compared to the rest of the state was that the analysis had erroneously included non-secure and alternative detention stays. Steve noted that CA would also be working with the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) data analyst to clarify issues related to those data. He said that CA intends to delve into the data to isolate detention episodes that are directly related to a youth's status as a dependent child. Steve reported that the recent workgroup meeting also included discussion of the situations in which group care providers call law enforcement. He noted that there are liability issues for group care facilities that parents do not face, resulting in a higher number of calls to law enforcement.

Steve said that there are several areas that should be explored:

- What is the Department doing to better document stays in detention in FamLink? Previous analysis revealed that these episodes were not well documented in the CAMIS system.
- Why are foster youth detained? Are these detention episodes related to the status as dependent children?
- Once a child is in detention, how does CA follow up and manage the case?

Dorothy Roberts reminded the group that the final step in this action step is for CA to develop system and practice improvements if problems are identified.

John Landsverk noted that there is not a Braam Settlement Agreement outcome related to juvenile detention, only an action step. He noted that, as with education and mental health, it is important to understand issues related to other service systems with which foster youth may have contact.

Jan McCarthy suggested that it may be appropriate for CA to consider mentioning the issue of juvenile detention in performance-based contracts with master contractors to ensure that this issue is attended to.

Dorothy Roberts stated that it is important to ensure that law enforcement is not used as a disciplinary tool. Steve Hasset noted that foster youth are more subject to scrutiny of the courts and therefore may be more likely to end up in detention. For example, runaway behavior that violates a court order may be cause for detention. Steve also noted that placing a youth in detention is a judicial decision, not a decision made by the Department or its providers.

The group agreed that the workgroup should continue to explore these issues.

Wrap Up

John Landsverk thanked CA staff for their preparation and the informative presentations. He thanked Becky Smith for standing in for Denise Revels Robinson, thanked the Regional Administrators for attending as they add value to the discussion, and thanked Elizabeth for putting together the performance data and other meeting materials. He reminded the group that the March meeting will be on Monday March 14, 2011 in Olympia and adjourned the meeting.

Handouts:

CA Updates, Denise Revels Robinson:

http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesDec10_CAupdates.pdf

Monthly Informational Performance Reports

http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesDec10_Monthlydata.pdf

Quarterly Informational Performance Reports

http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesDec10_Quarterlydata.pdf

Measuring and Understanding Placement Mobility- POC Slides

http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesDec10_POCPresentation.pdf

Foster Youth Educational Outcomes- WSIPP Slides

http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesDec10_WSIPPpresentation.pdf

Updates from Children's Administration- Slides:

http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesDec10_CApresentation.pdf