

## Minutes

Braam Oversight Panel  
Red Lion, Rainier Room  
SeaTac, WA  
September 28, 2010

**Panel Members:** John Landsverk (Chair), Jan McCarthy, Jeanine Long, Dorothy Roberts, Jess McDonald  
**Plaintiff's Attorneys:** Casey Trupin, Erin Shea McCann, Bill Grimm, and Tim Farris  
**Attorney General's Office:** Steve Hassett, Carrie Hoon  
**DSHS Staff:** Denise Revels Robinson, Elizabeth Jones, Deborah Purce, Joel Odimba, Myra Casey, Becky Smith, Ken Nichols, Randy Hart, Jeanine McShane, Marty Butkovich, Jessica Pierce, Nancy Sutton

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

John Landsverk called the meeting to order at 1:08 pm. He noted that the two-day meeting will primarily focus on performance outcomes and focused discussion on items that have shown limited increase in performance or a plateau. Presentations from CA will also include ways to improve performance in these areas.

### **Updates from Denise Revels Robinson, Assistant Secretary, Children's Administration**

Denise Revels Robinson introduced CA staff members in attendance. It was noted that the Budget update will be moved to tomorrow's agenda, as Rich Pannkuk, Director of Finance and Operations Support, was unable to attend the meeting today.

Many of Denise's updates below are summarized on a brief handout, available on the Panel's website with the meeting minutes: [http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesSept10\\_CAUpdates.pdf](http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesSept10_CAUpdates.pdf)

#### Update on Federal Child and Family Service Review (CFSR)

Washington State completed the Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) on-site review the week of September 13-17, 2010. An exit meeting was held on September 17, 2010 and the Federal Review Team shared their preliminary findings from the review. The power point presented by the federal reviewers at the exit conference is posted on the CA internet: <http://www.dshs.wa.gov/pdf/ca/CFSRExitConf2010.pdf>. Denise stressed that these findings are preliminary and the earliest the final report will be released will be late December 2010.

The review included 65 cases, both in-home and out-of-home cases. The review was held in three locations; King Co, Bellingham, and Spokane. These locations were negotiated with federal partners prior to the on-site review. The review had a very diverse and experienced team of reviewers, which included three presiding Judges, one in each site. This was made possible through outreach and through support from the Office of State Courts, which provided funding for other Judges to cover their calendars so they could participate.

Preliminary findings showed strengths and areas of improvement. CA, as with other states, will need to submit a Program Improvement Plan (PIP). Denise felt the review was well balanced and agreed with the findings, which reinforced that Washington State is on the right path.

The findings showed that areas of strength included:

- Meeting the physical and mental health needs of children
- Meeting education needs of children
- Preserving relations and connections for children in foster care
- Improved working relationship with Tribes
- Work to collaborate with courts
- Timely case reviews
- Community collaboration and partnership; more openness on the part of Children's Administration
- Involvement of birth parents, foster parents, youth in care and foster care alumni, CASA's, and Advocates
- Engaging youth in case plans

Areas of needed improvement referenced in the findings included:

- More consistency of CA practice statewide
- Improved initial and ongoing safety assessment and planning
- More focus on safety; moving from an incident focus to the safety of all children in the home
- The use of family team meetings statewide
- Family engagement
- Timely permanency
- Improved quality assurance of purchased services
- Concerns from foster parents regarding lack of notification of court hearings
- More ongoing training for social workers that is more practical and hands on
- Additional training for staff related to the Indian Child Welfare Act

Throughout the review, daily emails were sent to CA staff at the conclusion of each day, which included emerging themes. This allowed the information released at the end to not come as a surprise.

CA has started to think about how the Program Improvement Plan will look and how it will be integrated into what CA is already doing with a focus on strengthening daily practice. CA has 90 days after they receive the Final Report of the on-site review to negotiate a Program Improvement Plan.

Denise opened the floor to questions regarding the CFSR.

Bill Grimm inquired about the involvement of Judges in the review process and if judges were doing some of the actual case readings. Denise indicated they were on the review teams and were placed in jurisdictions other than the primary location where they preside and did review records alongside other reviewers. Bill noted this seemed to be a unique and positive piece of the review process and asked how it was arranged. Denise indicated there were several factors that led to their participation including a historically positive working relationship between Children's Administration and the Office of State Courts. Additionally, prior to the review a retired Judge, identified by a national resource center to support judicial involvement in the CFSR process, met with members of Washington State's court system. This provided the opportunity to request inclusion of Judges on the review teams. The goal was to have one Judge participate and CA was very pleased to have three participate.

Steve Hassett added there is a strong connection with the Washington State Commission on Children in Foster Care which was created as a result of recommendations from the Pew Commission on Children in Foster care and is co-chaired by a retired Supreme Court Justice and Denise Revels Robinson. Both the

Administrative Office of the Courts and the Superior Court Judges Association actively participate in the commission, which served as the oversight board for Washington's CFSR.

John Landsverk asked a clarification question on the permanency outcomes related to reunification and timeliness in the CFSR review which gives a national standard on the composite measure of 122.6, inquiring if it was good for performance to be above or below this standard. Denise indicated she would follow up and provide individuals the quick reference sheet that shows federal indicators and where performance should fall above or below that point.

Jeanine Long inquired if the 65 cases are representative of all the state and Denise responded they represent the state system and were identified by random assignment and a selection of in-home and out-of-home cases. The time period for the review was April 2009 – September 2010. There were more in-home cases than out-of-home cases.

#### *Update on Transformation Design Committee*

Denise shared that the last meeting of the Transformation Design Committee was held on September 20, 2010 and a copy of the power point presentation is available on their public website: <http://www.joinhandsforchildren.org>. It was decided that starting September 20 until December 2010, the committee will meet monthly. Prior to the September meeting the committee met on a quarterly basis.

During the September meeting, CA provided an update on activities that CA has been conducting since the last quarterly meeting. Activities included:

- Denise meeting with Tribes who expressed an interest in becoming a Performance Based Contracting (PBC) Master Contractor, with meetings held in August 2010 and more meetings scheduled for October 2010.
- Denise met with 350 foster parents statewide between June and August to listen and talk with them about their questions and concerns related to PBC.
- Private Agencies have had time to submit letters of interest to participate in the bidding process. The agency names will be posted on the CA website at the conclusion of the submission process and CA will provide a copy to the Panel.
- CA plans to release an outline of the Request for Proposal in October to service providers and Tribes. The formal Request for Proposal will be released in late November and the review of proposals will start eight weeks later. The review team will include a diverse group of individuals who do not have a perceived conflict of interest.
- The Stuart Foundation has agreed to provide funding for a multi-year commitment to develop a longitudinal database which will help the Department with responsibilities related to Performance Based Contracting.
- Private funding has been provided from a philanthropic group to conduct a statewide service assessment. This will be conducted by Partners for Our Children (POC).
- The National Resource Center on Child Protective Services agreed to provide a "Train-the-Trainer" on safety for in home-services.
- Annie E. Casey agreed to assist in training CA staff and Master Contract staff on Family Team Decision Meetings (FTDM).

The implementation of performance based contracts will position Washington State to better address a number of issues identified in the CFSR. Some of these areas include statewide service availability,

inconsistent service array in rural and urban areas, the need for stronger front-end in-home services and improved quality assurance of purchased services.

Jeanine Long asked if agreement has been reached with the union regarding the timeline, which is on page 12 of the CFSR power point presentation. Denise indicated that for Phase 1 the Union does not have concerns. Concern for jobs is centered on Phase 2 as it involves hiring private agencies to conduct case management in the demonstration sites, which is currently a function of Children's Administration staff. Phase 1 relates to the implementation of performance based contracting, which sets performance standards and requires outcomes, and for the department to reduce the number of contractors. The Union has raised some concerns around the use of Care Coordinators and the services families will receive. The Department is currently working with the Union to address their concerns. The Union's main concern is around the implementation of Phase 2 which under the current legislation will take effect in 2012.

#### Technical Assistance from the National Resource Center on Child Protective Services

Denise noted that Children's Administration is continuing to work with the National Resource Center on ways to improve child safety practice in Washington State specifically related to Child Protective Services. She shared that the Child and Family Service Review indicates the Department is on track with the need to focus on this area of practice.

The National Resource Center will be providing training, starting with supervisors, on the safety assessment. CA's approach to safety will be more comprehensive.

Jan McCarthy asked if this work is focused primarily on the safety of children in their own homes when calls are received or if it also includes safety of children in foster homes. Denise responded that the initial request was around safety of in-home services and the request has expanded to include children in out-of-home care as well.

#### Update regarding Increase in Dependency Filings

Elizabeth Jones noted that at the June 2010 Panel meeting during the caseload discussion, CA shared information regarding the increase in child dependency filings. She shared that as the agency thinks about practice, caseload and permanency, they are keeping a watch on the number of dependency filings. To help better understand what is occurring, Denise asked CA to look at some of the factors that might be contributing to the increase in dependency filings. Some of the data CA wanted to look at was not available, but they were able to examine data regarding CPS Intakes.

The available data shows an increase of 995 accepted CPS Intakes from FY09 to FY10. The filing rate for dependencies between FY09 to FY10 showed an increase of approximately 560 more children. Based on these numbers, the agency tried to see if there is a relationship between the accepted intakes and the dependency filing rate by looking at trends. In comparison to previous years, the dependency filing rate is much higher than in any previous fiscal year prior. When CA looked at accepted intakes and dependency filings by region, they were unable to find a strong relationship. The increase in intakes does not follow the same trend as the increase in dependency filing. Elizabeth reviewed the data charts and directed the Panel to the hand-out in their packet with data and charts that show the figures for accepted intakes and filings for each region.

Elizabeth shared that because limited data was available to understand potential factors impacting the increase in dependency filing, Denise had asked the Regional Administrators to provide their impressions about what they are seeing and what reasons may contribute to the increase in filings over

that last four months. Elizabeth noted that each Regional Administrator was prepared to share what they are seeing in each of their regions.

Marty Butkovich, Regional Administrator, Region 1 noted that looking back to March 2010, the filing numbers for Spokane County are pretty consistent with previous trends and they are not seeing much of an increase. While there is not a significant increase in filings, the severity of the cases has increased. Grant County experienced a population growth-- last year there were 59 filings; this year, just through September, there have been 64 filings and there will be more by the end of the year.

Ken Nichols, Regional Administrator, Region 2 shared that filing rates vary by office and are inconsistent across the region. Different offices are filing at different rates and there seem to be different factors around the region. In Benton/Franklin County, the population increased and there has been an increase in filing rates in that area. Yakima County, which is the region's largest county, has mostly experienced a plateau. Area Administrators have shared with Ken that they think the abuse is getting more severe, people are running out of resources which increases poverty rates, and gang activity is high and getting more severe.

Myra Casey, Regional Administrator, Region 6 reported that the region's 12 offices are seeing similar trends. The largest office, Vancouver, currently has the highest unemployment rate and people are losing resources which leads to higher stress and more abuse. Prescription drug abuse by parents is increasing and they are seeing a significant amount of mental health issues in parents and children. In Thurston County, there is a large military population. Fathers are returning home from war and are at higher risk of PTSD, domestic violence and child abuse.

Joel Odimba, Regional Administrator, Region 4 added that one zip code in King County is the most diverse in the United States and on average sees 300 intakes just from that one zip code per month. He feels some of the increase is due to the fact that the public is much wiser and willing to make referrals when they are concerned about child abuse and neglect. Additionally, Joel agrees with what others have said regarding the economy having an impact on family well-being.

Nancy Sutton, Regional Administrator, Region 5 shared that the region has experienced more serious physical abuse and neglect cases. As in other areas, families are less resilient and are running out of resources. The region has a large military population as there are multiple military bases in Pierce County and the CPS unit working with those bases has seen an increase in intakes of about 20%. Due to stress and deployment, there have been some attachment issues with their children. The region believes there has been an increase in physical abuse among military families. Region 5 has formed a strong partnership with the military. The military has assigned a doctor to develop a Child Advocacy Center within Madigan Hospital and they are engaging and working with the Children's Administration. Safety practices have been reviewed and the region is more consistently staffing cases earlier with the Attorney General's

Office. There has also been an increase in filings in Kitsap County which has a large naval base. While the numbers have been high, Nancy feels they have reached the peak and filings are beginning to decrease; however the new filing rate will settle at a higher rate than previously seen.

Randy Hart, Regional Administrator, Region 3 also noted that his region has two naval bases; one in Everett and one on Whidbey Island. In Everett, the region has noticed when the ship is docked there is an increase, and when the ship is out there tends to be a decrease, which he thinks is attributed to spouses leaving the area to spend time with family. Whidbey Island has not experienced a significant increase in activity which may be attributed to members of this military base seeing a smaller amount of

combat. The region is experiencing many of the same issues, with families who are running out of resources and have high levels of despair. The region has also seen an increase in drug abuse which is leading to more child abuse and neglect.

John Landsverk recapped that the agency is seeing more pressure on the process at the front end with investigations and more filings due to severity of abuse during a time when the agency is also facing budget reductions.

Steve Hassett added that if you look at the data back to 2003, each year there is a change of between 150 to 300 cases either up or down. In 2010, the numbers are up almost 600 cases from 2009, and those occurred in the last 4 months of 2010. If not for those last four months, the numbers for 2010 would be even with or slightly below the 2009 numbers. This is a very significant jump in a very short period of time. The number of new dependency filings have not been this high since the early 1990's, so this is somewhat unprecedented. Even looking at the figures available from the Administrative Office of the Courts for July and August 2010, the numbers are still over 400. So, while filings have dropped in the past few months, they are still high.

#### Implementing Initial Health Screens

Denise announced that the agency has prepared new policy that will be effective October 31, 2010 that will require all children entering out-of-care to receive Initial Health Screen as soon as possible, but no later than five days after entering placement. The agency knows there is still work to do to build capacity, but felt it was important for children entering care to receive proper medical care.

Jeanine Long joked by asking if they heard correctly that CA was implementing a policy requiring Initial Health Screens and shared that the Panel is pleased.

Training on this policy will be conducted in October 2010 and will cover the importance of the exam for the child's safety and to provide information to foster parents regarding the child's needs. Additionally, information around Initial Health Screens will be included in the October 2010 *Caregivers Connections* Newsletter for Foster Parents and Relative Caregivers and will also be posted on the Children's Administration's internet site.

Every region has identified health care providers that can conduct Initial Health Screens. The Panel was informed that the meeting packet CA prepared includes a summary of activities, including a look at performance data for several counties, policy documents, and a copy of a letter from Pacific Medical Centers, the largest provider in King County, that reflects the partnership between CA and health care providers. Denise shared that she will be sending out a letter of appreciation to providers who have been providing these services and will share a copy with the Panel when it is finalized. There is still more work to be done to educate health care partners on the difference between EPSDT and Initial Health Screens, but progress is being made. Denise shared that Joel Odimba and Randy Hart will share examples of the work being done and partnerships being formed in their regions to implement this new practice.

Joel Odimba indicated this illustrates a special commitment on the part of medical providers, and he noted that the letter from Pacific Medical Centers is an example of the collaboration CA is seeing between the agency and medical providers. Pacific Medical Centers has eight clinics and two diagnostic centers in King County and Lynnwood and has agreed to provide Initial Health Screens for children.

Randy Hart shared that in his region they have been most successful in Snohomish County and Bellingham. They worked through questions from health care providers, like why the exam needs to be done immediately and not in two weeks. The CHET Screening Specialists are helping coordinate these visits and they have been extremely helpful. They are trying to complete EPSDT exams within the first 5 days so the child does not need both exams within the first 30 days. If this isn't possible, as a result of a lack of available appointments or an inability to obtain medical records, the child receives an Initial Health Screen, and during a separate appointment he/she receives the EPSDT exam. In the areas between Snohomish County and Bellingham, there is a little more difficulty as doctors are stating they are busy and unless there is an immediate problem it is not beneficial for their time to complete the exam. Through discussions with these providers, they are starting to understand the importance.

One area that has caused a hitch in the process is the child must have a ProviderOne (the new Medicaid Management Information System) number in order for the provider to receive payment. In some instances this requires long calls to ProviderOne to receive the information so the child can be seen.

Denise acknowledged the hard work of agency staff and provider partners to bring this to life and said that things are moving in the right direction.

John Landsverk commented that the Panel feels very positive with this policy being put into place and the work of regional staff to address the issues. The Panel would like to know what the process will be for monitoring and tracking that visits are completed within 5 days.

Denise responded now that the formal policy will be in place, training will be conducted to ensure social workers know where and how to document this information into FamLink and in the future CA will begin to pull reports to confirm the policy is being followed.

Jeanine Long added that King and Snohomish Counties are large populous areas and asked whether the rural areas are seeing issues in participation from medical providers.

Ken Nichols from Region 2 indicated that they are having success in some of the very small areas with only three or four doctors available. The other area in which they are having success is the Tri-Cities area because of the availability of a large medical group. Yakima is finding more resistance because doctors have been around longer, have stable practices and do not appear to want to add additional services.

Dorothy Roberts asked what the nature of the resistance-- is it that exams haven't been done this way previously, that they won't receive payment or that they don't want to fit the child in for an immediate appointment? Ken Nichols responded that he feels it has more to do with the immediate time frame. Most medical offices want to see sick people first and some are not accepting new patients. The agency is also finding that a lot of doctors limit the number of Medicaid patients they will see.

Casey Trupin indicated that the Plaintiffs are pleased with progress the agency has made.

### **Plaintiff's Comments**

Plaintiff's asked to hold their comments until tomorrow to allow them to see the remainder of Children's Administration's presentation and hear the budget update.

### **CA Presentations on Monthly Informational Performance Reports**

Elizabeth Jones explained CA would be presenting information on CA's performance for each monthly report. Each presentation would address state and regional trends, what the agency is noticing, and

what has and is being done to improve performance. CA arranged for Regional Administrators to present on each outcome and welcomes discussion from the Panel and others throughout the process. Elizabeth shared that she will introduce presenters and navigate through the performance charts in the presentation (also included in the Panel's meeting packet).

*Informational data reports related to these presentations are available on the Panel's website at [http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesSept10\\_monthlyreports.pdf](http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesSept10_monthlyreports.pdf)*

### CHET Completion Screens

*Presented by Marty Butkovich, Region 1 and Ken Nichols, Region 2*

Overall CHET completion performance has increased from 78% in Sept 2009 to 84% in June 2010. There is still work to be done to improve performance; however significant progress has been made.

Jeanine Long asked a clarification question on the CHET Overall Completion data related to Region 5's performance changing from 40% in May 2010 to June 2010 at 62% and asked whether the region knew what the performance was in July 2010.

Nancy Sutton responded that the July data is not available at this time, however Region 5 made several improvements and filled vacancies and the preliminary results of those changes are evident in the performance data presented today. Over time, she expects the region's performance to continue to increase.

Ken Nichols added that the drop in performance for his region could be attributed to staff turnover and training new staff. Now that these changes have stabilized, he also believes we will see an increase in performance in Region 2.

Steve Hassett noted he would like to add that at the time Region 5 lost staff, their dependency filing rates increased which caused additional workload. The filing rates are also on the rise around the state which puts added pressure on the volume of work for CHET Screening Specialists.

John added that Region 3 has had the most consistent performance over time and is well over the benchmark. The other regions are showing fluctuation over time.

Jess McDonald commented that when looking at the data and hearing the explanations, everyone can see the significant impact vacancies have in relation to critical positions and the impact on performance. Additionally, when looking at the June 2010 numbers, for the percent completed in 45 days, performance is about 94% and this is pretty good performance for a large system.

Steve Hassett pointed out that the agency has looked at the incomplete counts for CHET Screen completion and found they include some children who left care within 60 days of entering placement. By not including these cases in the incomplete counts, this may make a difference in one or some of the regions meeting the benchmark.

John added that the benchmark is 90% and statewide performance is getting very close to meeting this number; however there is much variation in performance regionally which makes it tougher to reach the regional benchmark.

### CHET - Physical Health Domain

*Presented by Marty Butkovich, Region 1 and Ken Nichols, Region 2*

In May statewide performance was 81%. The regions that didn't meet the benchmark were Regions 1, 5 and 6. Some of the barriers to reaching the benchmark are:

- Appointments not available
- Exams completed but results not available
- Medical providers unable or unwilling to schedule the exam
- Caregiver did not follow through

Elizabeth Jones added that of the EPSDT exam results that are late, 80% arrive by day 44; 14 days after the 30 day requirement. She shared that CA is working to build provider capacity and educate staff and caregivers about the importance of EPSDT exams and the 30 day requirement. The partnership with the Medicaid Purchasing Administration's Fostering Well-Being Program should also help improve performance on this domain.

#### CHET - Education Domain

*Presented by Marty Butkovich, Region 1 and Ken Nichols, Region 2*

In May statewide performance was 84%. Regions that didn't meet the benchmark were Region 1 at 86% and Region 5 at 54%. Data shows the most significant reasons for the Education Domain not being completed within 30 days can be attributed to:

- Regions being unable to request records due to school being closed for summer break
- Education records were requested but they were not received within 30 days

Marty and Ken shared information about the work done with schools to see what the schedule and coverage would be over summer break. Some offices were successful and others got a late start and missed the chance to coordinate with the schools. In addition, it was noted that the economy is impacting school district budgets and a number of schools and school districts did not remain open over the summer.

John Landsverk noted that every region at some point has met the benchmark of 90% and the current struggle is regional variation. If one or a few of the regions can move up their performance, the statewide benchmark will be met. He also noted this is one of the toughest areas to meet as the challenges are mostly out of the control of CA.

#### CHET - Emotional/Behavioral Domain

*Presented by Marty Butkovich, Region 1 and Ken Nichols, Region 2*

Statewide performance in May was 89%. All regions met the benchmark with the exception of Region 5 which was at 63%. As shared previously, Region 5 experienced several vacancies and an increase in workload.

John Landsverk pointed out that in areas in which the agency has control over the work, great progress has been made and the regions show consistent performance. This is one of the domains that seems to be moving forward well. He commended CA for a good job on CHET progress and agreement was reached that discussion of the other domains was not needed.

#### Shared Planning Meeting Focused on CHET Screen Results within 60 Days

*Presented by Randy Hart, Region 3 and Ken Nichols, Region 2*

Performance for holding a Shared Planning meeting to address children's CHET Screen results within 60 days was 63% in June. CA performance has improved.

It is important to note that the number of children requiring a CHET Shared Planning meeting increased in the last six reporting months.

Regions 3 and 4 had the highest performance in June at 74% and Region 6 made the most improvement.

CA shared that the FamLink Management Report is making a difference along with the data clean up and staff understanding the expectations.

Jess McDonald asked for clarification regarding the meaning of "Not Documented." Randy Hart responded that this indicates that no record of a CHET Shared Planning meeting was found in the FamLink record. Additionally, Randy added that in his region's research of the data the majority of the time the meeting was held, but was not documented in the FamLink record. Regions are working to clean up the data and make sure meetings are documented.

Ken Nichols added that in Region 2, documentation is part of the reason for low performance and the recent decline in Region 2 can be attributed to training a new staff person. That individual could show where it was recorded as complete, however it was in the wrong location so FamLink was not identifying it as complete. He believes performance in Region 2 will start to increase.

Jan McCarthy added that the Shared Planning meeting is as important, if not more important than other areas because everyone needs to be able to see what is necessary to meet the needs of the child.

Randy Hart noted that part of the quality assurance and practice requirement is that the process needs to include parents' participation. In his region, if it is determined that a meeting occurred and the parent was not invited, it does not qualify as a CHET Shared Planning Meeting.

Jess McDonald asked if the Shared Planning meeting has value to workers in the field. Do workers feel this is a useful and necessary part of their casework? Ken Nichols responded that workers do agree the Shared Planning meeting is important, as it allows them to hear from all parties together. The meeting is essential to get all of the available information about the child related to parents, caregivers, and providers.

Jess McDonald pointed out that Region 6 performance in June was high for many of the CHET domains; however the CHET Shared Planning Meeting performance was 44% for the same time period. He asked Myra Casey, Region 6 Regional Administrator about the cause of this difference. Myra responded that there has been a push for workers to complete Shared Planning Meetings. She shared that one measure the region has taken to ensure these meetings are happening and documented is for the CHET Supervisor to pull a list of children requiring a meeting and post it on a shared drive to help facilitate scheduling of meetings.

Elizabeth Jones summarized that CA is making progress and still has a ways to go. Strategies and tools are in place to help improve performance, and having and using the FamLink report has made a significant difference.

John Landsverk commented that there has been a large amount of movement in this area, especially with the challenges in getting information entered into FamLink. The data shows great increase across state. However due to the amount of undocumented cases; this is most likely an underestimate of what is actually occurring. That being the case, progress is being made to move these numbers and resolve this outcome.

#### Early Support for Infant and Toddlers

*Presented by Myra Casey, Region 6*

Statewide performance for referring children to the Early Support for Infant and Toddlers (ESIT) program within two workdays if the CHET Screening Specialists identified a potential concern for developmental delays was 93% in June. CA has met the benchmark the last 3 months. Because of the small number of children referred to this program, it only takes a small number to not be referred to see a large impact on performance.

John noted that based on the data the benchmark of 90% has been met by all regions with the exception of Region 4 which is at 83%. However this is within the 10% regional variation allowed.

#### Monthly Visits

*Presented by Ken Nichols, Region 2 and Randy Hart, Region 3*

This is an outcome the department has been working hard on with staff to ensure documentation occurs. There has been a significant increase in performance this past year and June performance was 93%. Some of the regions are meeting the monthly benchmark and all regions continue to make this a high priority.

In order to reinforce continued high performance, clear communication with workers that visiting with children and making sure visits are documented is one of the most important aspects of their job. CA is emphasizing that the better you know the child and what is happening in her life, the stronger the safety and permanency planning will be. This measure is about planning, which means supervisors and workers are working together to make sure visits are planned out.

Jess McDonald added that time management is the number one challenge to casework, as well as supervision. It is clear that workers are planning their work better to ensure it is not all loaded at the end of the month.

John Landsverk added that all of the regions have showed marked improvement. There was no region during the last reporting period that was more than 3% below the 95% benchmark. This is good work and strong improvement. Additionally, it was asked if there is a single group of children that is not being seen consistently seen or whether it is more random. There is concern around children not consistently being seen.

Myra Casey indicated that children out of state through ICPC tend to only be seen by the other states social worker on a quarterly basis.

Jeanine Long asked if the ICPC cases could be separated out to help determine how many of the visits missed are due to out of state placement. Additionally, John asked if the number of out of state cases is known.

Denise Revels Robinson responded that CA would have to do additional research to identify the exact number of ICPC cases.

Elizabeth Jones shared that regions are tracking the reasons children are not seen and a recent roll-up of the reasons identified ICPC as one of the reasons. CA could work to identify the number of children that included.

Joel Odimba added that in Region 4 their research of children that missed visits in a month showed 3 were ICPC cases, 13 children were listed as on-the-run status, 37 children were due to improper documentation and there were several tribal payment-only cases that should not be included.

Jess McDonald asked about the data note which relates to "Visits by Other." These are not reflected in the count towards compliance but are reported to the Governor's Office. What is the reason for this difference?

Elizabeth Jones responded that currently the Governor's Office counts "Visits by Other" as compliance for this measure. The department is considering asking the Panel to also include these visits in the final performance count and wants to research a sample of these visits to confirm who social workers are documenting as "other."

For clarification, Jess McDonald asked if this includes visits conducted by private providers, and he asked if they use the same safety visit protocol as the department.

Elizabeth Jones shared that she believes private agencies have the same expectations for visiting children. She said that her understanding is "Visits by Other" are visits done by another worker, such as the ICPC worker or the private agency worker, not a CA worker, and that the other individual reports back and the social worker records the visit in FamLink. CA plans to research a sample of "Visits by Other" to confirm what they represent.

After Panel remarks and discussion regarding the role of private agencies, John summarized that the Panel recommends the department research the position of private agency social workers conducting visits, especially as CA approaches HB 2106 (performance based contracting). He added if the Governor's Office considers the visit as compliant, the Panel would want to consider the same. Steve Hassett shared that there are federal requirements regarding monthly visits with children in foster care that he believes limits the ability of CA to count monthly visits conducted by private agencies. There was some discussion regarding Washington State legislation that supports accredited private agencies conducting visits, the role of 2106 and the future direction of the department. It was noted this is an area to revisit and the ultimate goal is that children are being seen by a professional who has a relationship with them. It would be beneficial for CA's research to include the number of children that are out of state, on the run and visited by others. Plaintiffs' counsel added they look forward to seeing a proposal related to including "Visits by Other" as compliant.

#### Youth Transition (Exit) Staffings

*Presented by Marty Butkovich, Region 1 and Nancy Sutton, Region 5*

The department has a strong commitment to helping youth transition and has taken steps to improve performance. One issue related to this measure was around workers being notified of the need for a staffing. The transition staffing is supposed to occur before 17.5 years of age; however, staff were not being notified through the FamLink automated tickler until the youth turned 17.5 years of age, which

means it was already late. A change was made in September 2010 to the FamLink tickler and staff is now receiving the notification at 17 years of age.

Regions also now receive a monthly list of all youth turning 17 years old in the next six months to ensure identified youth receive staffing. CA has also provided staff a tip sheet that identifies who needs to have a transition staffing and how to document the meeting in FamLink. The goal is to start seeing improvement in this area over the next few months.

Social workers like these staffing because they care about these youth, and participation from external partners is also essential for these types of meetings. Youth are also eager to attend and, it allows them to feel they have an investment to offer and makes them feel like adults.

John Landsverk noted there are two things related to the small numbers. First, it is a small number of kids to take care of, which should make it more achievable. Secondly, this will cause large fluctuations in the numbers. In order to reach the 95% benchmark, every child will have to receive their staffing on time. The primary benefit to the low number of youth is that there are not many to be completed each month.

Steve Hassett added the Federal Government measurement is different than the panel measure, as it was developed later. The Federal measure now calls for youth exit staffings to be completed 90 days prior to exit. Steve will work to get the specifics regarding the Federal measure and provide this information to the Panel. This is an example of where the Federal measure and Braam Settlement Agreement measures are not aligned.

Dorothy Long and Jess McDonald both pointed out that the Braam measure allows for completion at six months prior to exit, which puts the department in a better position to be compliant with the Federal measure.

Elizabeth Jones summarized that CA recognizes that there is work to do on this practice and reaffirmed that CA is committed to youth and making sure they are prepared for the transition and to live independently. Because of the significant need for improvement, a one-page handout was created to provide an overview of key changes the department believes will have an impact on performance.

#### *Youth on Runaway Status*

*Presented by Marty Butkovich, Region 1*

There has been a slight increase in the number of youth on runaway status. In February 2010 there were 89 youth on runaway status and by August 2010 there were 110 youth. There tends to be an increase in the summer.

Region 1 has found that youth tend to run most from BRS Care facilities and it is usually the same children who tend to run, so they know who they are. Region 1 works very diligently with law enforcement to find these children and ensure their safe return to care.

Elizabeth Jones added that the department recognizes the serious safety threats to youth on the run. The department has made significant progress during the last several years and remains committed to decreasing the number of youth runaways and the numbers of days youth are on runaway status. The department has strengthened quality assurance activities, which include regional and statewide monthly review of youth on run status, including making sure there was notification and collaboration with law

enforcement, active efforts to search and locate the youth, and engage them when they are found to address their safety and attempt to prevent future runs.

Panel members asked questions and made suggestions about additional analysis that would be helpful, such as how many are new runs, where are they running from, how many are the same youth, separating youth on the run from those we believe are missing from care, and finding out why the youth are running from care.

Denise Revels Robinson added that the department does not normalize youth running from care. Denise committed to provide the Panel more analysis regarding these youth at the next Panel meeting.

### **Visits within the First 7 Days of Placement – Action Step**

*Presented by Becky Smith, Acting Director Field Operations Division, Children’s Administration*

Children’s Administration has had a policy in place since April 2010 that requires Social Workers to visit a child within the first 7 days of placement. This has continued to be a priority for CA as it is important to ensure the child is settling in, their needs are being met, and communication about the child occurs with the foster parent.

Currently there is no formal report available to measure this practice; however the department hopes to have a performance report from FamLink by March 2011. To ensure these visits are occurring, a question has been included in the monthly supervisor case review, which asks if the worker has seen the child placed in care and when.

John Landsverk asked if these visits are the same as the monthly health and safety visits. Becky responded they are not the same; however they are documented in FamLink in the same way.

Myra Casey and Ken Nichols added that they feel these visits are occurring; however the issue may be with proper documentation in FamLink.

The Panel asked for clarification regarding the part of the Settlement Agreement that requires this report. Elizabeth Jones shared this is a request that is attached to an action step that fell off the radar of the Panel and CA. She said that CA would develop the report sooner but the report development staff will be extremely busy developing reports that are due for the annual performance and informational reports to the Panel and for other CA reporting requirements. Elizabeth shared that CA is committed to providing the informational report no later than March 2011 and it will cover the time period specified by the Panel in the letter requesting an increased frequency in informational performance reports.

### **Public Comments**

John Landsverk called for comments or questions from the audience. There were none, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

## Minutes

Braam Oversight Panel  
Red Lion, Rainier Room  
SeaTac, WA  
September 29, 2010

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

**Plaintiff's Attorneys:** Casey Trupin, Erin Shea McCann, Ruvyn Munden (intern)

**Attorney General's Office:** Steve Hassett, Carrie Hoon

**DSHS Staff:** Denise Revels Robinson, Elizabeth Jones, Deborah Purce, Becky Smith, Rich Pannkuk, Joel Odimba, Myra Casey, Ken Nichols, Randy Hart (by phone), Jeanne McShane, Marty Butkovich (by phone), Doug Allison, Nancy Sutton, Jessica Pierce, Christy Garcia (MPA), and

**Others:** Kate Naeseth, Beth Canfield, Katrina Hale, Laurie Lippold, Jennifer Strus, Mary Manning, Ron Murphy, Melissa Palmer, Sydney Forrester

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

John Landsverk called the meeting to order at 9:06 am.

### **Quarterly Reports**

Elizabeth Jones explained CA would follow the same format as the previous day in presenting CA's performance for each quarterly report. Regional Administrators with Elizabeth's help would be presenting information on each outcome. A copy of the quarterly report is included in the meeting packet for Day 2 for individuals to follow along. She encouraged the Panel and others to ask questions throughout the process.

*Informational data reports related to these presentations are available on the Panel's website at [http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesSept10\\_quarterlyreports.pdf](http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesSept10_quarterlyreports.pdf)*

### **Health & Education Plans in ISSP Updated Every 6 Months** *Presented by Joel Odimba, Region 4*

Performance for social workers having Health and Education Plans updated in the ISSP was 63% for the most recent quarter examined. The goal is 90%. Performance was measured by a review of 46 records from five offices. Regional performance had a wide range, between 33% and 88%. Joel shared that his region continues to have the highest performance. During the review, 17 cases were rated as not achieved and the main reasons were:

- The child's health status was not documented
- The child's health and education status was not documented or it was with the exception of dental care

Joel shared that his region has done well on this outcome as a result of their early work to prepare for accreditation. They modified the ISSP template in Region 4 and supervisors do not approve ISSPs without the health and education plan being included in the plan. He said court partners look for this information as well, which helps reinforce the practice.

Dorothy Roberts asked if something specific happened in Region 3 to cause the decline in performance, or whether this was a result of the low number of cases reviewed. Randy Hart responded that there are two causes. One is the small number of cases, which doesn't reflect overall practice and in Snohomish County, which is the largest county in the region. Secondly, the current ISSP that includes changes to the template for this section is not currently accepted by the Courts due to issues with the margin size. Steve Hassett added that the court moved to an electronic scanning system which has a set requirement for margins and this form doesn't meet that criteria.

John Landsverk pointed out that Region 3 performance has been low over time even for the previous fiscal year when a larger number of cases were examined.

Elizabeth Jones shared that the good news is that other performance indicators, including recent preliminary results from the CFSR on site review indicate identifying and meeting children's health and education needs is a strong area of practice. It looks like the area of practice improvement is primarily focused on documentation of the plan. CA believes this is an area they can and will improve performance on as ISSPs are reviewed and approved by supervisors and a number of strategies are being implemented to impact this outcome including the FamLink Education Plan being a required attachment to the ISSP. Social workers and supervisors are receiving a reminder to use this plan in the October Policy Roll-Out Training. The Fostering Well-Being program is helping identify and document children's health needs in FamLink and CA is targeting quality assurance review to strengthen the Area Administrators' role in ensuring that supervisors are only approving ISSPs with this information included.

*DLR CPS Investigations Completed within 90 Days*  
*Presented by Jeanne McShane, DLR Administrator*

The benchmark for this measure is 100% which was met last quarter. The previous quarter's performance was very close to reaching the benchmark.

During FY2010, 858 of 865 assigned DLR CPS investigations involving facilities that provide overnight care to foster children were completed within 90 days or had law enforcement involvement requiring a longer investigation period. Of the seven investigations open longer than 90 days, 3 were in Region 3-- all children were from the same family and it is an ICPC case and the other state has been extremely slow to provide information needed to complete the investigation. The other four investigations that were not completed within 90 days were found to be staff training issues which have since been resolved.

Jeanne McShane noted that this measure is high on supervisors' radar. Through ongoing monthly review, they are paying close attention to performance to identify and address challenges. To help ensure cases are closed in a timely manner, the DLR CPS Program Manager sends out alerts each month on cases that are open longer than 60 days for review and follow up.

Timely DLR CPS investigations is a proxy measure for the outcome regarding timeliness and quality of DLR CPS investigations as that outcome requires a comprehensive case review that is done yearly in January.

John Landsverk noted the Panel recognizes the high performance and appreciates receiving the quarterly data. It was the timeliness of the DLR CPS investigations that was of most concern, so the proxy measure is helpful. DLR is doing very well and the Panel looks forward to the complete report in January 2011.

### Foster Parent Support

*Presented by Jeanne McShane, DLR Administrator*

Performance on this measure is from the Foster Parent Survey which has moved from an annual survey to quarterly. There has been some improvement on this measure; however it is an area that the department continues to work on.

To help increase performance, CA is providing training in all regions about foster parent relationships. The training is being provided by Denise Goodman, a national consultant. After each training regions identify and work on specific strategies. CA has also done a lot in each region to strengthen and promote relationships with caregivers, including the state and regional HB 1624 foster parent groups.

Additional steps that are being taken to increase foster parent support include the annual foster parent self-assessment, calling foster parents to touch base, and strengthening the foster parent training plan. CA has taken steps to provide foster parents mileage reimbursement for supporting foster children, posted CA staff contact information on the internet site and requires social workers to notify foster parents within one week when a new social worker is assigned.

Elizabeth Jones noted that performance on this outcome has remained fairly stable over time. John Landsverk added that since this is a survey response, there is a point where performance does not increase too much more and this may be one of those situations.

Denise Revels Robinson added that foster parent support and doing better on this outcome is really around the relationship between the social worker and caregiver. The department is committed to strengthening this relationship and the teamwork and engagement social workers have with caregivers. This includes invitations for caregivers to participate in FTDM and family meetings, court hearings, and development of the case plan.

John Landsverk noted the Panel agrees that the key to impact this measure is the relationship between the social worker and caregiver. The department has a number of support structures and forums for foster parents to have a voice that were not in place early on, like the HB 2106 performance based contracting) meetings. Beth Canfield with FPAWS indicated, and the Panel agreed, it would be helpful to see how foster parents rate support based on the length of time and number of children they have provided foster care services.

### Adequate Safeguards for Sexually Aggressive Youth (SAY)

*Presented by Ken Nichols, Region 2*

Ken Nichols noted that good progress has been made over time; however performance has seemed to level off this last year. Region 4 was the highest performer at 100% and Region 5 was the lowest at 43%.

CA is providing a reminder to social workers and supervisors regarding changes made and expectations for using the revised Youth Supervision and Safety Plan during the October Policy Roll-Out Training. Another area of focus is continuing to strengthen quality assurance review activities.

Elizabeth Jones noted the foster parent survey data shows CA needs to do a better job making sure caregivers receive the specialized training and a Youth Supervision and Safety Plan. However the good news is that when a plan is created, CA is doing a good job involving the caregiver in its development.

Caregivers report that they believe the plan meets the safety and supervision needs of children in their home.

Elizabeth Jones added that included in the meeting packet for Day 2 are the training results for caregiver SAY and PAAY training sessions for FY2010. This data shows there is a significant number of foster parents who received this training and gave fairly high satisfaction ratings to the training. Since there is such a difference in the reports, CA is wondering if the language used in the foster parent survey, referencing the training as “specialized training” may have caregivers thinking there is another training as they may not consider it a “specialized” training.

Jess McDonald asked if FamLink allows for the documentation of an identified SAY youth and evidence when a caregiver has received this training. He asked whether it would be possible to match the youth to see if they are placed with qualified caregivers using a FamLink report. Elizabeth Jones responded FamLink does have fields to document both pieces of information; however there is not yet a FamLink report that cross matches this data. This is currently a focus of CA’s quality assurance activities that includes identifying SAY youth, and making sure they meet the definition of SAY, their SAY status is documented in FamLink, they are placed with a caregiver that has received training, and that there is a Youth Supervision and Safety Plan in place that meets the quality test of Regional SAY leads. CA is making progress on the quality review activities but still has a way to go.

Jess McDonald noted that he thought the Panel was going to receive a copy of the quarterly QA report. Elizabeth responded this was discussed by the Panel and it was her understanding that the Panel reserved the right to request a copy of the report but did not make a request because the intention of the Panel is to manage to the outcome and not the process and actions CA takes to achieve the outcome.

CA shared additional improvement activities and the Statewide SAY/PAAY Program Manager, Doug Allison was present to provide additional context. CA made copies of the training on DVD and put together information and resources including the DVD for staff to provide to caregivers when placements are made. This information was also sent electronically to private agencies and Behavioral Rehabilitative Services administration.

Casey Trupin added that while performance has improved since CY07, it is difficult to assess trends as the foster parent survey questions have changed over time. The only time period that can really be looked at is FY09 and FY10, as the questions remained consistent.

*Adequate Safeguards for Physically Assaultive / Aggressive Youth (PAAY)*  
*Presented by Ken Nichols, Region 2*

This measure has seen slow but steady improvement over time. Region 3 was the highest performer during FY2009 at 83% and Region 1 had the lowest performance at 44%.

Elizabeth Jones noted that the most recent performance CA has by region is FY09 as the quarterly reports do not identify performance by region. To help understand performance in the context of applicable cases, the quarterly informational reports identify the number of applicable cases.

Elizabeth shared this outcome is usually considered along with SAY and the practice improvements CA discussed for SAY are the same for PAAY. CA acknowledges that work still needs to be done on SAY and PAAY to improve performance and work continues to strengthen our quality assurance review activities.

### Sibling Visits and Contacts

*Presented by Elizabeth Jones, Statewide Quality Assurance and Improvement Manager*

This outcome is measured by the foster parent survey and, as with SAY and PAAI measures, the questions have changed over time. In 2007 this was one question that asked about sibling visits and contacts; then in 2008 it was separated into two questions, one about visits and one about contacts. Currently the survey asks a series of questions about sibling visits and sibling contacts for each sibling relationship. Changes were made in hopes of providing CA additional information about the relationships of children in foster care with their brothers and sisters and reasons visits and contacts may not be occurring.

It is important to note that the current measure exceeds CA policy and the outcome measure itself as the outcome notes two or more monthly visits or contacts should occur with "some or all" siblings and the foster parent survey currently measures visits and contacts with "all" siblings, a higher standard that likely influence performance on this outcome.

Despite concern about the measurement, CA very much values and agrees that children in foster care should have a relationship with all of their brothers and sisters, where it is appropriate.

CA is continuing to work with John Tarnai with WSU on ways to make the display of survey data more meaningful and helpful in reviewing and understanding the results. John Tarnai was asked to provide additional information regarding what the data shows and what CA learned is that the majority of children have a brother or sister that does not live with them. The majority of brothers and sisters that do not live with them are half siblings and siblings between 5 and 17 years old. Roughly 20% of siblings that reside elsewhere are under 5 years old and 10% are over 18 years old. According to foster parents responding to the survey, siblings not placed with their brother or sister are living with other foster parents, the child's mother or father, or relatives.

When caregivers were asked why visits are not occurring they said the siblings live too far apart, the child's age makes contact (phone/computer) not possible, that CA did not coordinate visits, and the sibling was adopted.

CA continues to work to improve performance on this measure and gather additional information and understanding regarding what can be done to ensure children in foster care are visiting with their brothers and sisters.

The importance of sibling relationships has been emphasized with caregivers and staff. The March, April and May 2010 Caregiver Connections newsletter included articles that highlighted travel reimbursement available to caregivers for sibling visits, news regarding National Sibling Month, and Camp to Belong. Camp to Belong brings brothers and sisters placed apart together for a fun week of summer camp. The camp had another successful year this summer. It is directed by foster parents in partnership with CA. Washington used to partner with Oregon but the number of children that attend has grown so much that CA started its own camp. If there was more time CA would show a video about the camp, instead CA will forward a link to information about the camp. CA also provided a news release about the camp in the meeting packet.

CA is looking at other options to strengthen sibling placements by possibly bringing the Neighbor to Family program from Florida to Washington and strengthening recruitment and retention contracts.

## **Budget Update**

*Presented by Rich Pannkuk, Acting Director of Finance and Operations Division*

Due to **revenue shortfalls**, additional budget reductions are **required** to reduce general fund expenditures. In an executive order from the Governor, all state agencies have been directed to cut their general state fund obligations by 6.287% effective October 1, 2010.

Budget reductions have not been shared publicly, so CA will share as much information as possible pending public release. The reduction for CA is equivalent to \$19,298,000 **GF-State**. As outlined in the executive order, all general fund state proviso funding is subject to the 6.287% reduction, which is \$4.1 million. After these reductions, an additional \$15.1 million state general fund reduction is required to meet the total reduction required for CA.

Because of the funding **requirements and** provisos, there is not much that can be reduced from the services budget. Most of the reductions will be from the foster care program and administrative budget.

A formal message will be released September 30, 2010 to CA staff, stakeholders and partners to detail the budget cuts. Once the information is released, a copy of the message will be provided to the Panel and Plaintiffs.

## **Plaintiffs' Comments**

Casey Trupin noted that Panel meetings have truly become a good process. Having the Regional Administrators attend the meetings and help present the information is very useful. The level of information that is being provided by the Children's Administration is much appreciated. Most importantly, there have been meaningful gains over the course of this process; caseloads are down, CHET performance is up, monthly visit performance has increased, and, Shared Planning Meetings are increasing. Action steps have also seen progress.

Casey noted that plaintiffs have concerns regarding the budget update and the potential impact the significant reductions may have on progress that has been made. He added they do not feel there is a lot of room to make cuts within CA. With the current economy, people are at the end of their resources and this has already impacted Children's Administration. With fewer resources and more issues, that causes great concern that progress will be lost.

The good news is that CA is really developing a road map for change and these changes seem to be paying off. The perspective of leadership is greatly appreciated and it will be a while before some changes being made are reflected.

## **Medicaid Purchasing Administration Update**

*Presented by Christina Garcia, Supervisor, Fostering Well-Being Care Coordination Unit*

*See also presentation available on Panel's website at:*

[http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesSept10\\_CAPresentation.pdf](http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesSept10_CAPresentation.pdf)

Christina Garcia reported that between January 1, 2010 and June 30, 2010, there were nearly 3,000 children that were newly placed into foster care and determined to be Medicaid eligible. Each caregiver for these children received Child Profile immunization reports, which included immunization provider

information. The Child Profiles were also uploaded into FamLink so they are available to the social worker as well.

Between February 1 and June 30, 2010, the Fostering Well Being Care Coordination Unit received 213 referrals from Regional Medical Consultants, Child Health and Education Tracking (CHET) Screeners and social workers. 182 Care Coordination Summaries were developed by the Program Manager and Nurse. During this time period, 748 social workers, caregivers and providers were contacted to discuss care coordination needs for these children.

Effective July 1, 2010, the Foster Care Well Being Care Coordination Unit eliminated referral criteria for children in foster care. Initially, the program had very strict criteria which resulted in a high number of denials. It was decided that any and all children regardless of the medical condition, can be referred to the program.

The program is currently developing healthcare reports using Medicaid billing information to create a history of healthcare received. The goal is for these reports to be mailed to caregivers, both foster parent and relative care providers, within five days of a child entering foster care. Currently caregivers are receiving immunization records; however the expanded report will include information regarding medical diagnoses, hospital stays, emergency room visits, office visits and procedures, as well as medications. These will also be uploaded into FamLink for the social worker.

Jan McCarthy asked how the field knows what level children are appropriate for services and how the social worker knows when to turn to a regional medical consultant.

Christina responded that any child under age 18 who is in out of home placement who has any type of medical need is available to access services. Social workers have had an ongoing relationship with regional medical consultants, so they continue to go directly to them if they have a child with special needs, they need help with a primary care provider, or have general medical questions. They are also regularly referring children to the Fostering Well-Being Program.

#### **Update on Sibling Separation and Racial Disparity**

*Presented by Elizabeth Jones, Statewide Quality Assurance and Improvement Manager*

The Panel asked CA to provide an update on the first step of four steps to be completed to take a close examination of sibling separation data and the factors that may be impacting disparity. Step 1 was to be completed by the end of September 2010 and included an internal CA workgroup meeting to identify factors to look at in regard to race and develop a cross walk to available data sources to determine what is available and/or may need to be developed for additional analysis. The workgroup met and 6-7 factors were identified for closer examination. Unfortunately CA's data representative was unable to attend because of being out sick. Dr. Marian Harris from the Disproportionality Committee was identified as a resource. She was not able to attend the meeting; however she did indicate she would review the list of factors to make sure CA is on the right track. The next step will be to meet with Dr. Harris and then review Dawn Tatman's report and then the data development team will determine what data can be produced by the end of the calendar year.

The factors can be sent to the Panel, after conversations with Dr. Harris and Dawn's team occur. Step three is to create a larger workgroup to review data and determine what if any recommended strategies might help address racial disparity.

### **Juvenile Detention Action Step Update**

*Presented by Steve Hassett, Assistant Attorney General and Doug Allison, Statewide Intensive Resource Program Manager, Children's Administration*

*See also presentation available on Panel's website at:*

[http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesSept10\\_CAPresentation.pdf](http://www.braampanel.org/MinutesSept10_CAPresentation.pdf)

The first workgroup meeting was held in August 2010 and another meeting is currently being scheduled for late October or early November 2010. Representatives from the Administrative Office of the Courts were unable to attend the first meeting, so additional work is needed to identify data integrity issues previously identified. The first meeting had participants from each region in attendance, which was very informative. Regional representatives shared that they have established ongoing efforts to work with juvenile detention facilities. Regions have agreements that address at a minimum the requirement that juveniles only be released to a responsible adult or the Department. The counties with the highest number of detention stays, King and Pierce County, have agreements which involve cross system collaboration and system integration.

Children's Administration and Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration are initiating an integrated case management and wraparound approach to service delivery. Skagit County will serve as the pilot site and two other counties are still to be identified. This program will improve collaboration and coordination of services across DSHS.

Next steps for the workgroup are to obtain more detail on data already received, more closely review agreements in place and what might be built on and needed in other regions, determine potential significance for CA policy and practice, and obtain technical assistance and consultation.

### **Public Comments**

John called for comments or questions from the audience. John notes that the last two or three meetings have been positive and have included presentations of real data around performance. He stated that the participation of Regional Administrators is very helpful. The discussions that are occurring at meetings are meaningful and the Panel appreciates the work CA is doing. John added that the Panel appreciates the work Elizabeth is doing in her position. No additional comments were noted and the meeting was adjourned at 11:44 am.