



FINAL

DHS Children, Adults and Families
Child Welfare Advisory Committee
Future Issues Work Group
April 19, 2006

Attending: Judy Stiegler, Mickey Serice, Janet Arenz, Pam Patton, Mike Balter

The February 22, 2006, minutes were approved with these changes on page one:

- Arenz: Rep. Flores and ~~(who was the other Representative? _____)~~
~~are~~ is also looking at foster care.
- Serice: Has talked to Rep. Flores, but has not had contact with _____.

OPERATING PROCEDURES

No changes to the draft operating procedures were suggested during the comment period. However, the two recent email votes show that the process is not working as hoped. For example, the recent email vote on the Teens Subcommittee Report and Recommendations did not receive a quorum of votes. There was discussion on whether or not we need to clarify the email voting process in the operating procedures. It was decided that instead of addressing this in the operating procedures, Judy will clearly explain the process at the next CWAC meeting. In addition, when there is an email vote, the email subject line will be "CWAC VOTE" to clearly show the purpose of the email.

During the May 10 CWAC meeting, we will vote on the operating procedures and on the Teens Subcommittee Report and Recommendations.

FIWG ROLE IN DEVELOPING AND PRIORITIZING ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION BY CWAC IN ITS ADVISORY CAPACITY

- Stiegler: The goals of having FIWG develop and prioritize issues are to become more action oriented and have more focused meetings. The draft May 10 CWAC agenda does not have much room for additional issues. The pages attached to the draft agenda in today's meeting packet list all pending issues that have been raised at the last several CWAC meetings.
- Serice: Explained the draft agenda item titled "Sensitive Review Committee." It is a legislatively created, case specific committee that was recently initiated for the first time. It included four legislators among its members. Bruce Goldberg will be giving CWAC an update on how the committee works.
- Stiegler: We know SB 818 will be ramping up so it needs to be on the agenda.

- Arenz: In September 2006, Rep. Dalto will hold another hearing of the House Interim Task Force on Child Welfare. Janet expects SB 818 to be on that agenda.
- Stiegler: FIWG will prioritize and determine the pertinence and relevance, as well as the substantive aspect, of the issues.
- Balter: We need to put a handle on the immense amount of information we get at CWAC meetings. Also the social and networking time between individuals is distracting.
- Stiegler: Perhaps we should build a gathering time into the agenda from 8:30 – 9:00 to reduce the number of sidebar discussions, while recognizing the value of this sharing time. That half hour will be optional for members to network or prepare for the meeting.
- Patton: Hopes that DHS staff would be encouraged to attend during that half hour because members may wish to connect with them.
- Serice: It would be Ramona's decision whether or not to have her staff schedule this additional meeting time.
- Patton: There are other DHS staff, outside CAF, that she would like to be there.
- Stiegler: We will add the 8:30-9:00 gathering time on the May 10 agenda. Continuing on with the draft agenda, SB 818 will involve a major discussion. There may be room on the agenda for one more item.
- Arenz: Would like to have a summary of SB 818's concepts so CWAC can react to its impacts and make recommendations. She would also like CWAC to consider a second set of recommendations on other legislation we may want the Interim Task Force to consider.
- Balter: Let's go back to the purpose of the Advisory Committee and apply that to this topic. What is the dialogue between DHS and CWAC? We can ask DHS to prepare a summary of SB 818 so that we are prepared. There is an expectation that CWAC members come prepared to the meetings.
- Serice: Concerned about starting the practice of DHS staff providing background information on issues brought to CWAC by committee members. His recollection is that Angela Sherbo or perhaps another committee member brought SB 818 to CWAC. DHS has no ownership of the SB 818 document and DHS' analysis would be no greater than that by another entity. For this particular instance because he is familiar with SB 818, he is willing to do a summary of the concepts. However, he cautioned against letting this set a precedent. Already a majority of the subcommittee work defaults to DHS.

- Arenz: Framing helps move an issue to action. Suggested asking Angela Sherbo to prepare the summary, because it is likely she has already done some of the work.
- Stiegler: Reminder that we are an advisory body to DHS. There is a fine line between advising and reacting to what DHS is doing. We don't need legislative output to all we do. We will use FIWG to gel down our process. From a reactive standpoint, we can be reactive to legislative concepts as well as making recommendations concerning how they are perceived across the state.
- Arenz: Agrees that members need to take on an equal share of the workload. If a member provides a summary, it speaks to preparedness. A summary should direct people to the pertinent section (section 5).
- Serice: He has draft notes on SB 818 and can do a summary for this topic, but again, he does not want to set a precedent in having DHS do the prep work of framing issues raised by members.
- Balter: Suggested that when members bring issues to CWAC they provide an issue brief with background information and anticipated action. This will help determine if it is appropriate to bring the issue to CWAC. Members would have to take more energy than simply saying they were concerned about the issue.
- Patton: For that reason, the member who brought it to CWAC should prepare the SB 818 summary. The question we need to answer is how it will impact the work of DHS Child Welfare.
- Arenz: Suggested having a panel presentation.
- Balter: Does having a panel mean we are at the information/education stage and not at the discussion stage?
- Stiegler: The person bringing an issue to CWAC needs to do the homework of framing the issue. The information and discussion stages may meld together in one CWAC meeting because our meetings are so far apart. The person who raises the issues needs to frame it to show how it ties into CWAC's advisory capacity.
- Arenz: One hour on the agenda is not long enough for SB 818 if we are going to form recommendations. We need to react to the concepts and send our recommendations to Rep. Dalto prior to the next Interim Task Force work sessions or hearings in June and September. The June Interim Task Force meeting will be the last opportunity to testify before Rep. Dalto presents his final work during the September hearing. The May 10 CWAC meeting is not too early to discuss the concepts in SB 818.

- Stiegler: Issues go through a three-step process. First there is information and education: what is the issue, why is it an issue and what do we want from CWAC. Then we have a discussion phase. These two phases can possibly occur during the same meeting. The final phase is action.
- Patton: SB 818 is not on her personal radar, so she would need someone to explain the impact on DHS Child Welfare. Reading the bill does not make that clear. What does the bill say, what are the concepts Rep. Dalto wants to include and what motivates him to reintroduce it. Then we can discuss how it impacts the child welfare system and determine what the issues are that we need to relay to Rep. Dalto. We may need to have it on the agenda again in July as a follow up to the June Interim Task Force's work session.
- Serice: There are only a few CWAC members who will have analyzed the bill: Nancy Miller and Angela Sherbo for example. Mickey could talk on a global level about the bill and could also give the DHS perspective, section by section. However, we don't want the discussion to be centered only on DHS' perspectives.
- Stiegler: The end result needs to be recommendations on how to manage the issues in SB 818 during the next legislative session. CWAC may have a recommendation saying if DHS should take a formal position or not. How can we frame things so the outside world sees a set of responses? Also noted that Rep. Dalto has said more may be added to what is currently in SB 818.
- Patton: How will the Legislative Subcommittee fit into the work on SB 818?
- Balter: The issue is not SB 818, but the Interim Task Force on Child Welfare. We use "SB 818" as a code for all that Rep. Dalto and that committee are doing. The issue is if and how CWAC responds to the Interim Task Force: Should we understand what is going on in the Interim Task Force, should we be alerting our constituent groups, should we be making recommendations to DHS, and should we be talking to Rep. Dalto as CWAC members.
- Serice: SB 818 may be separate from the Interim Task Force. Rep. Dalto describes it as a framework to "fix child welfare." He is now moving to foster care with the Interim Task Force. During the 2005 session, no one testified against SB 818. The red flags come from the attorneys like Angela Sherbo and AAGs in interpreting it if it becomes law. SB 818 touches many areas, which is how it would tie to the Interim Task Force.
- Balter: CWAC is the group most interested in child welfare and ought to be looking for continuity in its discussions. We are using the constraints of Section 5 of SB 818 in our discussions, when our concern should be much

broader in guiding public policy. We would probably get disagreement, but at least we need to know where each member stands.

- Arenz: We need to put our cards on the table so we know if we can come to a committee recommendation.
- Balter: We all lose if the committee is derailed because of a member's personal issue.
- Stiegler: Suggested a process in which we can see where members have commonality of thought on an issue. CWAC should not be co-opted by one member. As a group that deals with child welfare in total, we need to find where we are in agreement and where we are unable to agree. CWAC may take a position different from an individual's position. The purpose of the Legislative Subcommittee is to be a resource for DHS to funnel into and receive information from other groups as heads-up to possible legislation; the same as it was previously.
- Balter: We need to be clear on what DHS can and cannot do. The agency has certain constraints that it must work within.
- Stiegler: DHS will have rationale for why it accepts or does not accept CWAC recommendations.
- Arenz: This topic will be a great exercise to test our process.
- Serice: The Legislative Subcommittee meets before the next CWAC meeting. Angela Sherbo and Nancy Miller are both subcommittee members. It may be possible to have the subcommittee prepare a summary of the concepts in SB 818 and the positions of each of the constituency groups represented in the subcommittee for the next CWAC meeting.
- Patton: That would set the foundation for the discussion on the impact of the bill.
- Stiegler: Because members have varying levels of interest and expertise, we first want to bring everyone up to the same level of knowledge on the concepts. FIWG needs to frame the desired action to come out of the discussion.
- Balter: The action may be to have a discussion. We may ask CAF and other constituency groups to present and then the action may be that members take the discussion back to their groups.
- Arenz: CWAC needs to develop a position on the various concepts in SB 818.
- Stiegler: We may not be able to achieve that because everyone is not at the same point of knowledge.
- Arenz: Concerned about the lag time between meetings. If we have the informational part in May and don't meet again until July, we forget the conversations and have to start over.

- Patton: Suggested letting CWAC decide what action item it can come to that can be passed on to Rep. Dalto.
- Stiegler: Reminder that CWAC's audience is DHS, not Rep. Dalto.
- Serice: We may be asking CWAC to do more than it is capable of because it meets only six times per year. Perhaps CWAC is not the mechanism to do what we are wanting. The Legislative Subcommittee was kept at the information sharing level to give heads up to the subcommittee members on legislation. As for CWAC presenting to a legislative body, a full committee has 21 members and each will have a different point of view and interest in child welfare legislation.
- Patton: Rep. Dalto talked about fixing a broken system: CPS was broken and so is foster care. The conversation needs to be on the broken system of CPS and if there are concepts in SB 818 that CWAC could support. Do we want to focus only on the concepts in SB 818 or the bigger picture of the Interim Task Force on Child Welfare? Are there critical concepts that are necessary to have child welfare do the best job it can? Those fundamental values could be submitted to the Interim Task Force in writing. We could then do the same in July for foster care.
- Arenz: From the Oregon Alliance of Children's Programs' point of view, waiting until a bill is presented is too late. As an advocacy group, that will jeopardize their relationship with Rep. Dalto.
- Patton: That is why each member's voice needs to be heard; to know the ramifications of the concepts in SB 818 for their constituency groups. Then Judy can lead into a discussion on whether CWAC can form a recommendation.
- Arenz: We still have the ability to discuss these issues with outside entities.
- Serice: Yes, but the chair is the one who speaks on behalf of CWAC.
- Stiegler: We are going through a change of culture and this is our test topic. Understands Janet's timelines, but there is nothing that prevents us from sending a set of recommendations in writing to the Interim Task Force.
- Balter: We must either deal with the issue of urgency or set it aside. There will be core issues every legislative session. Urgency creates panic, we rush and cannot agree. We need to realize that the timetable moves along and we can try to meet it, but if we don't, we have not failed.
- Arenz: Unfinished business on May 10 can go to the Legislative Subcommittee.
- Balter: If we develop core documents on these core issues, we can refer back to them.

- Stiegler: Covering both the concepts in SB 818 and foster care is too much for one meeting.
- Arenz: The Legislative Subcommittee could develop a core set of values in foster care as a starting point for that topic. Use the subcommittee to do work that the full CWAC can respond to.
- Serice: Talked with Rep. Dalto following the March 24 Interim Task Force hearing and suggested the use of work groups for his legislative concepts, explaining how these interim work group bring all partners together. In those work groups there is either consensus or an agreement to disagree so there are no surprises to the partners as the concepts move forward. Rep. Dalto was receptive to the work group idea. If CWAC members talk with Rep. Dalto, they could let him know if they are interested in joining a work group.
- Balter: Again, we need to keep asking ourselves what can the CWAC realistically do and what do we redirect back to the constituency groups of the members. How do we respond to the opportunity the Interim Task Force represents. One function for CWAC could be to act as a clearinghouse, getting as much as we know on the table. As members have contact with Rep. Dalto, they would be asked if they are willing to report back to CWAC about that contact. FIWG is the tactical group to decide what is realistic.
- Serice: Is not sure how free members would be to share or if it is appropriate for CWAC to ask. Those contacts may fall under lobbying.
- Balter: If our goal is to create an environment where we can have frank conversations about policy, we need some way to mine the information that may be privileged. We either look at this as a responsive process to the Interim Task Force or it's a dialogue. What is our relationship to the Interim Task Force?
- Patton: That is not what CWAC is about. CWAC is about a position, a value, a bottom line of what needs to be included in any system on child welfare. We then take our collective clout to the Interim Task Force, saying that all these people (the CWAC) have an interest in child welfare and they all have this value or position as a priority of what needs to be included in the Interim Task Force's product. We should make that statement public and say it in every forum and to the press. Sees our role being to frame what should be included in the Interim Task Force's legislative concepts. After the bill is introduced, the discussion occurs on how to do it.
- Stiegler: Are you saying the role of CWAC in responding to the Interim Task Force is to identify core values in CPS or foster care or another aspect of child welfare that should be considered when drafting legislation?

- Patton: She went through a similar exercise with OYA regarding young women. Examples of these core values are well trained staff and adequate facilities to serve the clients.
- Stiegler: We would want to key into specifics, not just say we value the well being of children. At this stage, such an end product is difficult.
- Arenz: The product changes on the circumstances. At this time it can be a broad recommendation.
- Stiegler: We can only respond conceptually at this time.
- Balter: Suggested CAF framing it on what is essential for good practice. We need to address what is on the minds of the Interim Task Force. Change occurs because of case specific incidents.
- Stiegler: We don't want to spend our meeting time on May 10 on a recitation of SB 818, but on the key problematic areas and how CWAC can respond in a proactive way. The same focus needs to be used on foster care. At this stage, we cannot respond to the Interim Task Force regarding foster care because their proposal is unknown. All we could do is identify problem areas and what the Interim Task Force needs to consider or what to include when making changes to the foster care system.
- Patton: We probably would not be able to come to an agreement, but could support something the CWAC would say.
- Stiegler: We need to tee it up so that we get sufficient information and an adequate discussion to lead to an action.
- Patton: Suggested changing SB 818 from a discussion item to an information item. The discussion item should be the Interim Task Force and Dalto's conversation with CWAC in March. CWAC should focus on what to give the Interim Task Force as their concepts forward. We need to take advantage of the opportunity presented to us in the Interim Task Force.
- Arenz: Is in favor of sending SB 818 to the Legislative Subcommittee. One of her hopes for CWAC is to communicate CWAC positions outside DHS.
- Stiegler: Asked if there was consensus that the core of the discussion on May 10 needs to be focused on the Interim Task Force, identifying the opportunity and perceived issues in the foster care area.
- Arenz: Offered to share her notes from the Dalto discussion during the March CWAC meeting.
- Balter: We need to determine how we frame the parameters of anything CWAC is going to discuss; what the core elements are of that topic. We don't have the topics yet. We think the Interim Task Force is interested in CPS and foster care. That gives direction to the non-negotiables.

- Serice: Recalled that Rep. Dalto said he wants to fix the child welfare and foster care systems. SB 818 is written and moving forward for CPS. The foster care piece is still abstract. Concern for SB 818 was raised by a CWAC member because we know it is moving forward.
- Stiegler: SB 818 is concrete; we can be reactive to it. We can be more proactive with the foster care issue because it is not cemented in yet. Asked if it would serve the purpose for the May 10 meeting to have key members frame what we are to be reactive to and what we can be proactive to. Those issues would be moved to the Legislative Subcommittee to frame and bring back to CWAC in July. The members more involved with the issues would be assigned to lead the work.
- Serice: Cautioned that the Legislative Subcommittee's time on April 28 will be focused on discussing CAF's draft legislative concepts and there may not be room on agenda for additional discussion.
- Stiegler: Suggested that on May 10, the members who attended the March 24 Interim Task Force hearing briefly report first.
- Balter: Then we need to contain the discussion with key issues to be answered by CWAC. At what level can we find agreement and is there value in having a discussion. If we keep the discussion at a detailed level, we will have disagreement; however, if we keep it at too high a level we will have instant agreement but no meaning. We need to start with what we believe Rep. Dalto will focus on.
- Stiegler: She will take the minutes from the CWAC meeting with Rep. Dalto and format them into a bulleted list of the issues he raised.
- Balter: Then we can merge that with individual member's experiences in interacting with the Interim Task Force. Is not sure of the usefulness of a value-based framework of the big areas. Those broad values are already widely known. Rep. Dalto wants action.
- Serice: The question of how to respond to the opportunity given in the Interim Task Force provides the framework for CWAC.
- Balter: We have both a 90-day and four-year horizon, plus process vs. content. We need to meld the two.
- Stiegler: We also need constructed conversation, not freeflowing.
- Arenz: CWAC needs to be told upfront what is wanted from the discussion. At the end of the discussion, there can be a directive to the Legislative Subcommittee and members' constituent groups.
- Balter: We are accustomed to being reactive. It is more difficult to be proactive.

- Stiegler: Will send a draft agenda to FIWG for review before it is finalized.

Meeting adjourned.