

Foster Parent 1624 Consultation Team
Meeting Minutes
April 18, 2011

FINAL

1624 Representatives Attending: Cindy Gardner & Kristin Otoupalik (Reg. 1), Mary-Jeanne Smith & Victoria Erwin (Reg. 2), Debra Ellsworth & Shala Crow (Reg. 3), Talya Miller & Tess Thomas (Reg. 4), Elizabeth Griffin Hall & Barbara Holbrook (Reg. 5), Marci Miess & Amy Gardner (Reg. 6), Beth Canfield (FPAWS), Ginger Schutt, Co Facilitator

CA Representatives Attending: Denise Revels-Robinson, Bernice Morehead, Meri Waterhouse, Joel Odimba, Edith Hitchings, Kathy Ramsay, Peggy Devoy, Jeanne McShane, Leah Stajduhar, Becky Smith

Others Attending in Person: Sheila Huber - AAG, Tammy Hay - FOSD, Phyllis Bishop - PJs Full House Reg. 5, Lyn Okarski - FCRN, Avreayl Jacobson - DVR, Gayle Hays - recording for FPAWS

By Phone: Mike Canfield (FPAWS), Stephanie Allison-Noone, Ken Nichols, Lorenzo Lopez, Randy Hart, Dru Powers, Lisa Johnson, Marty Butkovich, Laurie Palmquist

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION SUMMARY	DECISIONS	ASSIGNMENTS DUE DATES LEADS
<p>Co-facilitator Bernice Morehead began meeting with an introduction reminding group about ground rules; also to mute phones when not speaking and to state your name when beginning to speak. Brief welcome to group. Review of presenters at meeting related to the agenda schedule (Sheila Huber, AAG & Avreayl Jacobson, DVR). Discussion: relevance of DVR presentation to agenda and flow of regional issues. Decision: Ms Jacobson will be asked to wait to present after all regional issues have been discussed.</p>			
Minutes	<p>Suggestion: minutes should be referred to as “notes”.</p> <p>Process reviewed from last meeting.</p> <p>Hard to hear who was present at last video conference.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hold conference call to identify process of approving minutes. This will be separate from the charter work group calls. ● Charter group will include section on approval of minutes. ● Minutes are tabled. 	<p>No one identified for lead on assignment or due date.</p>
Finish work on the draft charter	<p><i>Clarification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● FPAWS requests to delay topic on Elimination of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Agreed - 19: delay Rate Assessor topic to 	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION SUMMARY	DECISIONS	ASSIGNMENTS DUE DATES LEADS
<p>(FPAWS)</p> <p>See Agenda Addendum for full description of issue</p>	<p>Rate Assessor Positions to combine with Region 1's discussion of this issue</p> <p>-----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee members on workgroup have sent out information by workgroup members • Material also sent out with comments from Becky & Nancy • Requesting feedback on work to date and seeking approval of what's been worked on to date. (<i>Copy of work provided for meeting are last notes and not fully vetted by work group</i>). • Workgroup members re-identified as: Kristen, Mary-Jeanne, Shala, Kathy Ramsay (<i>as needed</i>) Region 3, Barbara Holbrook, Elizabeth Griffin Hall, Marci, Mike and Beth; and that CA would identify staff to participate. Those participating from CA are: Jeanne, Nancy, Meri, Tom Stokes and Myra • Workgroup has had difficulty in scheduling meetings with full participation. • FPAWS is seeking approval of sections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Background, ○ Purpose and "Function" • Suggestion to add a "Minutes" section to charter. • Vote requested on Background, Purpose and Function sections. These sections will be voted on separately • Clarification: who is entitled to vote? How many votes to CA? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 10 - CA ○ 12 - FP reps ○ 02 - FPAWS • Vote called for on "Purpose and Function" section. Clarification requested: <i>1st paragraph, 2nd sentence under Purpose and Function: "Once CA begins pilot work with Supervising Agencies", does</i> 	<p>Region 1 discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A "Minutes" section will be added to the Charter • Agreed - 19 in favor of approving the Charter Background Section • Charter: Purpose & Function Section: (1st paragraph, 2nd line will be changed to read: "Once CA begins the pilot work with Supervising Agencies as required in 2009 House Bill 2106, (Part 2) they will be included in this agreement." • Charter: Purpose & Function Section: Page 2, #3 might read: "Serve as a forum for foster parents and CA to discuss these issues and proposals for changes to CA regulations, policies and procedures, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Canfield, Lead

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION SUMMARY	DECISIONS	ASSIGNMENTS DUE DATES LEADS
	<p><i>this refer to the Pilot work in part 2 of the 2106 legislation? Confirmed: this reference is specific to the Pilot Sites in part 2 of the 2106 legislation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification requested: in Purpose and Function Section, page 2, #3: “Serve as a forum . . . for changes to CA regulations, policies and procedures;” Does group want to include language relating to practice issues as well as policy issues? • Possibly inserting language “and develop proposals and recommendations” that would help make this section broader and more practical. • “Serve as a forum for foster parents and CA to discuss these issues and proposals for changes to CA regulations, policies and procedures, and develop proposals and recommendations regarding CA’s practice.” • Thanks to Beth and work of committee. 	<p><i>develop proposals and recommendations regarding CA’s practice.”</i></p> <p>Agreed – 19: make the above changes to the Charter Purpose & Function Section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of committee to recommit to this work and a finished project. 	
<p>Recent Practice / Policy changes related to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dependency Guardianships • Elimination of Rate Assessor positions from Region 5 have impacted consistency where foster parents receive support and resources (FPAWS) 	<p>Support for youth aging out of dependency guardianships</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avreayl Jacobsen, DVR representative on supports and services available through DVR for youth aging out of dependency guardianships. • Information by Sheila Huber, AAG. Review of Dependency Guardianship Statute and RCW 74.13.03. Dept. is granted authority in providing continuous foster care services for children who turn 18. • RCW 74.13.03 is silent on youth who are in Dependency Guardianships. The dependency is now under Court jurisdiction. High needs youth will qualify for DDD services. • Guardianship statute states guardianship ends when youth turn 18. • Youth in guardianship are in permanent placements – this isn’t foster care. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foster parent liaisons stated their concern to have their issues heard first. If Ms. Jacobsen can present at end of the meeting, the team can hear material. (Ms. Jacobsen was unable to stay past 3:00) • Per Becky Smith: CA reviews plans and resources for youth in foster care prior to 18th birthday. Caregivers can request review for youth in dependency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No assignments given. Meri will ensure the Caregiver Connection will have a segment on this policy.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION SUMMARY	DECISIONS	ASSIGNMENTS DUE DATES LEADS
<p>See Agenda Addendum for full description of issue</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No statutory authority exists for CA to provide foster care services for youth who are not in foster care. • ILS services - certain eligibility standards for the program. Dept. must stay within its statutory authority. • CA, and DDD have procedure where they review youth in foster care at 17.5 years; however there's no practice regarding youth in dependency guardianship. • Some youth aging out can't pass background checks – requires families to make choice: to continue caring for youth, or have current foster children move. • All guardianships, Title 13 or Dependency Guardianships are achieved permanent plans. • Statutory language limits the authority of the Dept. • Caregivers with a guardianship youth nearing 18 yrs. old can consult their licensor to request consideration of an administrative approval for youth's criminal history or abuse/neglect history (done on case by case basis), as there are some issues that can't be waived. • <i>Question:</i> Does the state have responsibility for youth in dependency guardianships – is there liability for the state? • <i>Response by AAG:</i> the court has some responsibilities, but the department does not. The department is released from responsibility unless Order specifically details what responsibility CA has. • Educational Training Vouchers (ETVs) is a federal program with eligibility requirements set by federal government. Program specifically designed for youth 18, aging out of foster care who have not achieved permanency, or their guardianship was not ordered by the Court until after youth's 16th birthday. 	<p>guardianship to ensure plans and resources are identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This information will be identified in the Caregiver Connection. • Joel Odimba, RA (new Region 2) confirms caregivers who encounter difficulties in initiation of an administrative approval/waiver, should contact respective AA's office and make sure Joel is aware of situation 	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION SUMMARY	DECISIONS	ASSIGNMENTS DUE DATES LEADS
<p>Re-address the social networking issue for clarity (Reg. 1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved social networking policy on what can be posted on web is included in meeting packet today. Policy sent out to all CA staff and DLR licensors. Assistant Secretary has approved the policy. What youth can post on their own is a much more complex issue and must be handled case by case between social worker, foster parent and youth – with safety as primary concern.. Policy 43022 states "Allowing children access to electronic communication based on reasonable caregiver discretion and on electronic device availability." Draft of WAC re-write has no release date yet (delayed 6 mos. – 1 year). Foster parents will be involved in the feedback loop. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training and clarification on policy will continue for CA staff ensuring questions are addressed. <p>Jeanne directed all DLR staff to not make valid licensing finding on these issues without consulting with her first.</p>	
<p>Concerns regarding youth aging out of guardianships with no additional services offered through the state. (Reg. 1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need/want way for foster parents to know where to go to get information for youth aging out of guardianships & training on finding websites. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> foster parent Listserv other electronic resources Reg. 1 foster parents received a helpful document based on youth's age All pertinent info should be in one place. DVR information should be available to all foster parents. WIN 211: over 5,180 health & human service providers, 9,280 sites and more than 16,390 local services available throughout Washington to help meet needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> www.independence.wa.gov Put link on foster parent web site if not already there. www.win211.org Information Network included in meeting packet/Caregiver Connection/foster parent web site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jeanne McShane Completed Meri Waterhouse include info on FP website and in June Caregiver Connection
<p>DLR investigations (Reg. 2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statewide issue on DLR investigations, time required for investigations, disruption of foster child in placement, and DLR allegations connected to retaliation against foster parents, inconsistencies in practice, i.e. when corrective action is used - vs - founded findings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One individual does not make removal 	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION SUMMARY	DECISIONS	ASSIGNMENTS DUE DATES LEADS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information in packet on improved time frames for DLR investigations Decision to move a child in a DLR investigation is case-by-case. Safety issues must be reviewed and issues impacting the child and foster parent relationship. Decisions made jointly by DCFS and DLR staff and not by just one person. <p>Question: How many children removed as the result of C/AN allegations?</p>	<p>decisions; this is a shared decision jointly with DCFS & DLR staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jeanne can begin tracking this data. This will take time to identify a trend. 	
<p>Concerns regarding staff morale (Reg. 2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question: Is CA meeting foster children's needs with many changes taking place in a few short months? CA continues to review caseloads locally, regionally and statewide. Monthly health and safety visits, timely investigations and meeting children's needs are always monitored. Concern one worker has 51 cases. Lack of quality in case management, rush-rush to do ISSP day before court, workers are overworked and exhausted, morale problems, 2106 also impacting. Thank you for advocacy on behalf of social workers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More work on educating workers on 2106. No workers should have 51 cases – will look into region data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Becky
<p>Provider Numbers FamLink & SSPS (Reg. 3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Foster parents receive payments and reimbursements through FamLink using their SSPS number; this is not the same as the provider number in FamLink. Families don't know about these numbers or the differences. Used for mileage & respite payments. Question: how to get the FamLink provider number out to all foster parents? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> send out to newly licensed foster parents both FamLink provider ID and SSPS ID. Existing foster parents can contact licensor for information Licensors can bring the ID numbers with them during the relicensing visit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jeanne is interested in hearing from foster parents with their ideas on this issue. Jeanne and reps will consider best ways to get info out to foster parents on SSPS and FamLink numbers. All new foster parents will receive info in their licensing letter. Utilize FP Listserv & 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jeanne - review system on how to share this info with foster parents. Provide info to Caregiver Connection & FP Listserv.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION SUMMARY	DECISIONS	ASSIGNMENTS DUE DATES LEADS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Caregiver Connection could be a vehicle to inform caregivers about these identifiers. ○ Could number be put on license 	<p>Caregiver Connection letting foster parents know to call licenser if they have question on provider #s.</p>	
<p>Foster Parents transporting kids not placed with them have been required to complete volunteer applications (Reg. 3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Randy Hart took this issue on and has remedied problem in Region 3. ● Licensed foster parents who volunteer to transport children in care not placed in their home only need to fill out these forms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Federal IRS W-9 ○ Statewide Vendor Registration & Payment Options ○ Create TEMS Volunteer Profile ● This can be carried statewide, however no other regions have experienced difficulty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guidance on mileage reimbursement for foster parents who are volunteering can be handled consistently statewide as needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meri - Ensure all regions have information. Do we want forms on foster parent web site?
<p>Communication 1-800 number used when a child goes on run. (Reg. 4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Joel and Region 4 have worked to resolve the issue in region 4. There is a need to refer this to CA's policy unit for an updated clarification on this policy. ● At this time foster parents will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ notify local law enforcement and ○ obtain the run-away report, and ○ notify child's social worker ● CA policy identifies role of the social workers and followup they do after you have contacted them. ● Keep communication on the forefront. Receiving information back sometimes can still can be slow. Continue to address support for communication. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Current policy should be reviewed in Program & Practice Improvement (P&PI) to clarify this policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Leah Stajduhar, P&PI Office Chief
<p>DLR document created to bring forward (Reg. 4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Region 4 has a document they have created and work on with Gia Wesley regarding DLR. ● Document has case - specific info that couldn't be shared, so document was not placed in packet. ● Suggestion: from a statewide perspective this needs to be identified - what discretion means and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bring together group of foster parents and CA leadership team to resolve the remaining issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Jeanne and Tess

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION SUMMARY	DECISIONS	ASSIGNMENTS DUE DATES LEADS
	<p>whose discretion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WACS on character and unsupervised contact with criminal history were given as examples. Subjectivity and inconsistency could play a part in actions with foster parents. When decision made to remove child this is not decided by one person, it is a decision by CA and includes both DLR and DCFS. There are multiple issues addressed in the document Request to hire a Deputy Regional Administrator for DLR has been submitted for approval. Should hear decision within next month. 	<p>statewide issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific examples and trends seen Develop recommendations for resolution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jeanne and Tess to pull group together. Joel will offer representative from region 4 Kristin and Marcie also volunteered. 	
<p>Ideas that can mitigate new budget impacts on foster families <i>(Reg. 5)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Region 5 foster parents are pleased to see there will be no cuts to the foster parent reimbursement at this time. Thanks for sending the letter notifying foster parents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion Only 	
<p>Retaining experienced and successful foster parents - pending cuts to foster care reimbursements will add greater stress and pressure on foster families <i>(Reg. 5)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Still concerned about levels of care for really high needs children, if those dollars should be cut. Raising this as an issue, as retaining well trained foster parents is a concern. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion Only 	
<p>Foster parents not in favor of cuts to mileage or foster care rates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Region 6 does not want to see the cuts to foster parent mileage or reimbursement rates take place. These issues rose to the top of the list at the regional meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion Only 	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION SUMMARY	DECISIONS	ASSIGNMENTS DUE DATES LEADS
<p>Disappointed CA would consider this option to heal the budget. (Reg. 6)</p>			
<p>Regional rate assessment concerns (Reg. 6)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistency issue: rate assessments approvals - processed differently in each region. Seeking consistency in chain of command approvals. Region 5 currently has no rate assessors. Can rate assessors be specific positions? CA will have rate assessors for every region (new structure regions 1, 2, & 3) Approval Process on rate assessment already exists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rate assessors will exist in all CA regions. CA will ensure info on rate assessment is re- sent to all regions on approval process and need for consistency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Becky/Meri send update to regional offices on rate assessment approval process.
<p>Budget Review – Tammy Hay, FOSD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tammy Hay Chief Of Forecast And Budget presented budget information 	<p>Discussion with Q & A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once CA knows final decisions on the budget and the Governor gets approves or vetoes, the Assistant Secretary has committed to a special briefing for foster parents on what the final budget is. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Becky Smith will organize special briefing – after final budget established.
<p>PROCESS TO APPROVE THE MINUTES</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion on creation, distribution time frames and distribution of minutes for meeting. <i>Suggestion:</i> refer to this document as notes, rather than minutes. Discussion: process of input to minutes and process of inclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members approved 5 days to produce the minutes and send out to all members Members have two weeks for review and return edits to the minutes. Meri and Bernice to review all edits to 	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION SUMMARY	DECISIONS	ASSIGNMENTS DUE DATES LEADS
		determine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct insertion into the record • Reason suggested edit was not inserted is provided to group 	
Other Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request to consider Other Business and Issues • Should Old Business, Unresolved Issues or Subcommittee Reports be added to Minutes? • Development of the Agenda was completed at the Pre-planning Conference Call on March 21, 2011 • Beth reported on work of the Caregiver Training Improvement Plan Committee • Multiple questions addressed on 2106. • Unified Home Study implementation is pushed back. During 2011 CA will launch in one region and move across state and begin with newly licensed foster families. • DLR staff will complete the Unified Home Study and children will maintain their DCFS social workers – this maintains separation under Executive Order that created DLR. • Unified Home Study will eliminate need to complete separate home studies for foster parents and relative caregivers when they move to become an adoptive family. • Unified home studies will be consistent state-wide; begin in one region to help identify problems, concerns, as well as what works well, as process moves along. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion Only 	
Meeting Adjourned at 3:35 p.m.			