



FINAL

DHS Children, Adults and Families
Child Welfare Advisory Committee
Future Issues Work Group
October 10, 2007

Attending: Ramona Foley, Benjamin Hazelton, Nancy Keeling, Julie McFarlane (by phone), Pam Patton, Angela Sherbo (by phone), Judy Stiegler

Minutes Recorded by Karrie Pitrof

MINUTES

The minutes of the April 11, 2007 and August 8, 2007 meetings were approved.

TEEN ISSUES IN CHILD WELFARE SUBCOMMITTEE

- Stiegler: In spring we disbanded the old committee. The new committee will be more project-oriented, with focus on assignments or tasks that it is given to achieve. We need to identify a clear purpose and charge. So far we have the confirmed membership of Pam Patton (chair), Janet Arenz, Phil Lemman, Julie McFarlane, Jennifer McGowen, Trish Reding, Benjamin Hazelton, Mickey Serice and Kevin George. Mickey Lansing will assign someone from the Commission. She mentioned Matthew Tschabold, but this has not been confirmed yet. Kent Hunsaker will also assign someone from the Confederation of School Administrators. Last spring we decided that although we may have a CAF liaison identified, the person may change depending on the topic. We'll need to send out reminders once we get tasks, etc.
- Keeling: Suggested we add tribal representation.
- Sherbo: Suggested someone from PSU, School of Social Work. Maybe Catherine Kahn.
- Stiegler: The first task is to establish the purpose. We want this group to focus more on issues of urgency. It should be more project or task oriented. We need to identify a specific charge and what we want them to focus on.
- Patton: At the end of the last project it seemed that the project got bigger than what the team intended to focus on and had less energy because of that. It wasn't focused on child welfare.
- Stiegler: With the last committee we had scope creep. The scope got so big it was looking at the Commission and MDTs, etc. Not everyone was clear what the subcommittee was and where it was going. If we can pare it down to a specific charge, we would be more successful. We're going to need to keep manageable
- Patton: We want to make sure the subcommittee is a team that would respond to priority issues given to them by CWAC. Looking at priority areas. One priority

would be to look at policy and how teens are being addressed in the safety model, how vulnerability for safety is being translated to local office levels, and watching over time to see if the changes are making a difference. Looking at mental health services also.

- Foley: We will have to have a way of breaking out issues and outcomes, as they will be different depending on the local area.
- Keeling: Maybe an issue to look at is how teens are being served. For instance, could we do more within the family and not just in foster care?
- Patton: What is the impact of vulnerability having on teens entering the system? Then, look at what kind of care they are getting.
- Stiegler: We might think about having the group look at the whole OSM and the impact on teens in particular. Do we see it improving? How is it being handled at the local level?
- Keeling: Una should be on subcommittee.
- Foley: We need to identify how teens are being served and what the safety issues are for teens. For instance, it would be different than how we serve toddlers.
- Patton: Identify how teens are getting into the child welfare system.
- Foley: You could invite someone from the field to be on the subcommittee to give that perspective.
- Patton: If we look at the back of the blue sheet, numbers 3 and 4 can come off the list. The mental health piece can come later. We can start with number 1, and then ask CWAC if we should move on to number 2. Teens' ages need to be discussed. This may be more of an advocacy issue. There's a possibility that it could result in a recommendation that comes out of looking at number 1.
- Foley: In number 2, we can think about what the budget package will look at.
- Keeling: Again referencing number 2, talked about laws and rules that govern criminal history records.
- Stiegler: Number 4 is already in the works; and then we can look at 1 and 2, with 3 rolling into 1.
- Foley: The Juvenile Code Revision Workgroup and the Commission are currently reviewing the age range issue. If we are looking at changing ages we serve, we need to make sure we identify budget issues in the process.
- Stiegler: We will need to bring this to CWAC to find out if this is critical for us to work on. We look at how kids are served once they reach 18 to 21. The courts look at each case, case by case. Maybe we need to put number 2 as the broader issue. Today we need to narrow the list and prioritize. We'll have to talk to CWAC to see if there is tremendous support to move on. We need to narrow initial tasks, then choose one and go from there.

- Patton: The subcommittee should focus on the OSM, the definition of vulnerability, and if there are contracts that would be specific to teenage parents.
- Stiegler: If we keep the language broad to look at that population, we can identify the gateways and roadblocks.
- Keeling: We can look at protective action and how those issues look around teens as parents.
- Patton: I'm fine with having teens qualify for child welfare services, but we need to make sure we're not disqualifying teens.
- Sherbo: I'm fine with having the court identify.
- Stiegler: As far as meeting, just a suggestion from a staffing perspective, we might try to align meetings. The next meeting of FIWG is December 12, 2007. Do we want to schedule TICWS that afternoon from 1:30 to 3:30?
- Hazelton: Is it realistic for the sub-group to meet every other month? Would it not be more beneficial to meet every month so that it can be proactive?
- Keeling: We probably want to in the beginning so we could have a true impact.
- Patton: If we could meet in the afternoon of CWAC and in the afternoon of FIWG, we could be done in six months, by April.
- Foley: The CFSR report is due in December. Expediting this group can enhance and help inform the PIP. It will be helpful to know what the problems are and then help in building a quality assurance piece.
- Patton: Proposes the first meeting be November 14, 2007, with part of the plan being to have an interim report due by the March CWAC meeting.
- Foley: It would be helpful to develop a list of questions as we walk through the model to look specifically at teens.
- Patton: We will need a baseline.
- Foley: We have the Status of Children report to use as a baseline.
- Sherbo: Agrees with the schedule being every month with first meeting being November 14, 2007, at 1:30.
- Hazelton: Agrees with the schedule also.
- Stiegler: Notice of first meeting will come from Stiegler and Patton. In that meeting, we will set a task and clarify initial focus of the group. Pam can work with staff to identify questions. At that first meeting, we can frame inquiries that the Department will work from to provide data. Pam will work with Una.
- Patton: We will already have 6 months of data.
- Foley: We need to be clear about what dates we should be looking at. And we don't know how many teens we have in the system. Anna will know how to access those.
- Keeling: Patton can sit with Una to craft the questions around the OSM.

DECISIONS: The Teen Issues in Child Welfare Subcommittee will meet monthly, beginning on November 14, 2007.

Pam Patton will meet with Una Swanson to develop a list of questions for the subcommittee to use in looking at the Oregon Safety Model and how it impact on teens.

Membership will be expanded to include Una Swanson and representation from the Commission on Children and Families and the Confederation of School Administrators. It may also include PSU, tribes and a child welfare field staff.

FRAME ISSUES FOR NEXT CWAC MEETING AND BEYOND

- Stiegler: We need to look at the pink sheet, which outlines suggested CWAC agenda items, and figure out what to purge and then prioritize.

DECISIONS

- CWAC agendas should focus on two main issues: OSM and keeping kids out of foster care.
- Transportation of Foster Children to School (HB 3075 – 2005 Session)
 - Keep for information/update exchange in order to keep the group apprized of the issues.
 - Do not need a new workgroup.
- Overrepresentation of Children of Color in Foster Care
 - Need to have as one of the things we discuss.
 - FIWG to frame issue.
 - Specific cohort to serve better.
- Adoption Resource Center
 - Keep for information update.
 - Resource Center's report can go out with minutes prior to the next CWAC meeting.
 - CWAC members will participate in reviewing the recommendations.
- Relative Care
 - Bundle with Preference for Relatives and Current Caretaker Rules.
 - CWAC needs periodic update.
 - Bundle with OSM and keeping kids out of foster care.

- Note: CFSR and Holder report both had issues around how we treat and work with relatives.
- Face-to-Face Visits
 - Should be ongoing item for updates.
 - Need to rename the “response” categories to convey what we need to do.
 - Data needs to show how many kids/parents – not just percentages.
 - CWAC should continually focus on the big picture.
 - FIWG will look at reports and add pared down discussion items as data suggests or implies anything that CWAC needs to target or focus on.
- Drug and Alcohol Treatment Services for Parents with Children in Foster Care
 - Should be ongoing item for updates.
 - Need to rename the “response” categories to convey what we need to do.
 - CWAC should continually focus on the big picture.
 - FIWG will look at reports and add pared down discussion items as data suggests or implies anything that CWAC needs to target or focus on.
- Oregon Child Welfare Safety Model Quality Assurance Measurements
 - Identified as one of two main focus areas.
- DHS Rulemaking Process
 - Drop from list, as being looked at department-wide.
- Preference for Relatives and Current Caretaker Rules
 - Bundle with Relative Care.
 - Add both relative items to OSM category.
- Budget Reduction and Add-Backs
 - Drop from list, as not child welfare stand-alone issue.
- Adoption and Guardianship Assistance
 - Drop from list
- How to Best Serve ‘meth babies’
 - Drop from list, as part of OSM and keeping kids out of foster care categories.
- Capacity of Access to Services and Service Availability to Young Adults
 - Drop from list, as will be addressed in Teen Issues in Child Welfare Subcommittee.
- Draft minutes of FIWG meeting should be presented at each meeting, with reference to information received and reviewed.
- Add updates or reports on anything the agency thinks is important and appropriate.
- Face-to-Face and Alcohol and Drug issues should be ongoing items for updates.

AREAS OF FOCUS AND DATA NEEDS

- **Policy: Keeping Kids out of Foster Care**
 - Children of color: numbers we serve are high. What are the reasons?
 - We need to brainstorm reasons why.
 - We need to know proportions of numbers of each population in each area.
 - We need to compare children of color with Caucasian children – big difference when we look at incarcerated parents.
 - Overall we should look to see what the issues are, not assume we know them.
 - Need to make sure we are talking factual not just anecdotally.
- **Operational: Oregon Safety Model (OSM)**
 - Concerned about visitation.
 - Clients want more attention paid to visitation.
 - We need information regarding visitation.
 - This item contains elements of OSM and staffing model happening at same time.

Meeting Adjourned.