

**JOIN HANDS FOR CHILDREN**  
**MINUTES FROM CHILD WELFARE TRANSFORMATION DESIGN COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**JUNE 14 and 15, 2010**

---

**Members Present:** Honorable Judge Leonard Costello; Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson; Charlotte McCullough; Mary Armstrong; Jeanine Livingston; Judge Chris Wickham; Nancy Foll; Mark Courtney; Maureen McGrath; Carole Holland; Ken Nichols; Nancy Sutton; Steve Hassett; Mary Meinig; Catherine Lanham; Jerry Meninick; Sharon Osborne; Gwendolyn Lawson Townsend; Gwen Gua for Honorable Carleen Anderson; Jeannie McShane; Ian Grant; Mary O'Brian; Honorable Liz Mueller; Corinna Burris for Brenda Lopez; and Rebecca Peck for Honorable Henry Cagey.

**Staff Present:** Julie Dunnington, Sarah Lee, Melissa Takade, and Benjamin Berres, Partners for Our Children; David del Villar Fox, April Potts and Andrew Kramer, DSHS Children's Administration; Jennifer Strus, Washington State Senate Committee Services; Sydney Forrester, Washington State House of Representatives Office of Program Research.

**Guests:**

Representative Ruth Kagi, Washington State House of Representatives.

---

**JUNE 14, 2010**

***Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Overview***

Child Welfare Transformation Design Committee (CWTDC) co-chair, Judge Leonard Costello, welcomed committee members, gave an overview of the first day's agenda, reviewed meeting ground rules, described how the audience could offer public comment and asked all of the CWTDC members to introduce themselves. During introductions, Judge Costello welcomed new committee member Mary O'Brien, who will be replacing Marian Harris. Mark Courtney announced that he is returning to the University of Chicago and will be replaced on the CWTDC by Partners for Our Children (POC) Executive Director, Benjamin de Haan.

***Review Procurement and Contracting Process and Requirements***

Andrew Kramer of Central Contract Services Operations Support and Services Division of DSHS gave a presentation on competitive procurements and how it relates to 2SHB 2106. He described the four phases of the procurement process: creating the Request for Proposal (RFP), releasing the RFP, assessing proposals, and producing the contract. He also gave an overview the steps required to complete each phase and offered a preliminary RFP timeline.

- Creating the RFP – Currently underway
- Releasing the RFP – October/November, 2010
- Reviewing/Assessing/Scoring RFP – January to March, 2011
- Producing/Awarding contracts – March/April, 2011
- Start-up work begins – End of March/April

After the presentation, the committee members asked questions:

- Gwen Gua asked if the staff facilitating the contracting process would be contacting minority groups for input around the issue of minority and Native American children so that the contracting language is clear. Andrew Kramer deferred the question to Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson, who responded by saying that Children's

Administration (CA) has taken steps to discuss the contracting process during recent meetings with Washington State Tribes. She also mentioned that CA would be asking for the input of the Washington State Racial Disproportionality Task Force on issues such as cultural competency.

- Mary Meinig asked if organizations submitting questions regarding the contracting process would be identified by name on the website. Andrew Kramer said that, in his experience, vendors are not typically identified by name.
- Ian Grant asked about the size and composition of the RFP evaluation teams. Andrew Kramer said that no decisions have been made.
- Steve Hasset asked if reviewers with prior knowledge of a particular vendor would be allowed to factor in their knowledge of the vendor's service quality into the scoring process. Andrew Kramer said that reviewers with prior knowledge who cannot review bids objectively might be asked to step down. He also said that each proposal must include references to help the review team score the proposals.
- Charlotte McCullough asked if Washington State has any experience with Performance-Based Contracting (PBC) in other departments. Andrew Kramer said that PBC is used in IT contracts within Washington State. He also mentioned that he has been compiling a library of other PBC contracts from which they can borrow language.
- Maureen McGrath said that the 60-90 days to ramp-up for receiving children and families might not be sufficient. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson said that after contracts are awarded, there would be a 90-day "start-up" period to prepare for children and to build infrastructure and skills.
- Nancy Foll asked if CA would be asking for a "letter of intent" from vendors to assess the number of proposals CA will have to score. Andrew Kramer said that CA is considering this. She also asked if there would be a bidder's conference. He said that if CA holds a bidder's conference, they might have one on the east side of the state and another on the west side.
- Mary Armstrong asked how evaluators will be chosen. Andrew Kramer said that CA will be selecting evaluators, but that CA will be asking for input in the later part of the meeting.

### ***Performance-Based Contracting (PBC) Update and Discussion***

Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson gave a presentation on the status of converting existing contracts to PBC's and a summary of the next steps for CA as they move toward releasing the RFP. She updated the group on the progress that's been made since the last CWTDC quarterly meeting. She talked about CA's communication efforts and what they have been doing to garner input from stakeholders about the PBC process. She let the committee know that private funding was made available for Partners for Our Children to conduct a statewide assessment to explore gaps, needs and strengths within the child welfare service system in Washington State. The assessment will not only explore the views of service providers, but also the larger stakeholder community. It will be completed by the end of summer 2010. Information from the assessment will be used by both Children's Administration in finalizing the payment model and by providers in responding to the Request for Proposal. She reported that a national consultant, Tony Broskowski, has been hired to aid CA in developing a financial payment model. Also, contact was made with the Region 10 federal office staff in response to TDC members' concerns that DSHS did not have the authority to contract with private agencies to deliver child welfare services. The Region 10 federal office said that Washington State may contract with private agencies to provide services, assuming that these private agencies will maintain compliance with federal policies, and also offered training on federal policies to Washington

State private agency partners. Lastly, she explained that CA is working to reassign employees to craft an internal fiscal and program quality assurance infrastructure.

Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson explained that one of the goals of Performance-Based Contracting is to increase community capacity and ensure a consistent service array for every family in each region of the state. Each Master Contractor will be responsible for providing – either directly or by subcontracting – and coordinating the full service array for the children and families in their geographic area. This will reduce the actual number of contracts managed by Children’s Administration, while improving access to services for the children and families served. Each Master Contractor is to have a group of “care coordinators” that will work directly with Children’s Administration social workers. It will be this team, care coordinator and social worker, which will work with the parents, relative, foster parents, youth and children to ensure their voices are heard and their needs are being identified and addressed.

Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson presented a timeline for the RFP process. In October/November, CA will issue the Request for Proposals (RFP) for Master Contractors to provide services in the six administration regions. The RFP’s will be scored by an independent group of evaluators and contracts will be awarded in the March/April 2011 timeframe. Then, there would be a 90-day start-up phase during the summer of 2011, allowing time for capacity building. Referrals to Master Contractors will not start until each Master Contractor passes an onsite readiness review to ensure that each is prepared to organize and coordinate and/or deliver all required services.

She stated that performance will be tied to payment, and that outcomes will be used. She talked last about funding sources and budget assumptions and what payment models CA is considering. She communicated that the long-term goal is to have Master Contractors help CA service more children and families with the same level of funding (i.e., fewer dollars going to placements so more funds can go to in-home and community-based services).

Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson stated that the discussions that are occurring in the community have been a wonderful opportunity to explore Washington State’s strengths as well as areas that need attention. She encouraged everyone to continue to submit questions and concerns as they surface.

After the presentation, Judge Costello opened up the floor to questions:

- Jeanine Livingston asked, if contracts go into effect on July 1, 2011, how MC’s would be paid until they pass the readiness assessment. She also asked if there would a case ratio for the care coordinators working within a MC. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson said that she expects there will be a ratio set so that the workload is manageable and quality can be ensured. With regard to the first question, she expects that CA will be paying MCs for the start up activities such as training and capacity building.
- Liz Mueller requested a little more clarity around what is meant by saying a service must be available in all service regions. She also asked if CPTs and LICWACs would continue to operate in their same form. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson replied by saying that both CPTs and LICWACs will continue operating in their same form. To the first question, she said that this is an issue that must be dealt with during the capacity building language of the RFP.
- Catherine Lanham was concerned that there are still many unanswered questions that need attention. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson said that she shares her concerns and replied that under Part 1, she expects that foster parents licensed by the state will see very minimal changes. In the cases where foster parents are licensed by a private agency, she sees with less clarity, but that the issues are being dealt with.

- Representative Ruth Kagi echoed some concerns she heard during a meeting with providers on the east side of the state. The first concern related to the issue of developing a robust infrastructure to be able to take on the responsibilities and accountability required. The second concern related to the feeling that the specialized services offered by small agencies might be difficult to fold into this process. Asst. Secretary Denise Robinson responded to the second concern first. She said that these services could be included in the service array presented to each new MC. In response to the first concern surrounding infrastructure development, she feels that discussions with individual providers might get to an answer best.
- Mark Courtney commented that the language describing the populations of children served needs more clarity. He also commented that he is unclear how MC's would be held accountable to outcomes and that he is not clear on how MC's would input data into a management system to produce outcomes figures.
- Ian Grant observed that Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson's presentation did not describe any efforts to provide communications to foster youth and alums and asked if there were any future plans to communicate with youth. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson replied that she would be working with a few groups, including representatives from the Mockingbird Society. He also asked for additional clarification between the care coordinator and a social worker from a foster youth's perspective. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson said that the Care Coordinator would be primarily responsible for the day-to-day case management activities and the social worker would be primarily responsible for the legal requirements of managing cases. The public social worker would also be responsible for developing a transition plan toward independence. CA's ultimate goal is for maximum interaction between care coordinators and social workers.
- Sharon Osborne suggested that CA should prepare some slides explaining their thoughts on infrastructure development; e.g. QA/QI, billing systems, etc. She also requested that the bidders be allowed eight full weeks between when the RFP is released to when bidders must submit completed proposals.

### ***Review Breakout Group Assignments***

Performance Based Contracting experts Charlotte McCullough and Mary Armstrong explained the afternoon assignments and gave directions for reporting back to the committee. Charlotte McCullough said that the purpose of the breakout groups was to get committee members input on a number of key issues regarding the RFP and scoring issues.

The committee members were asked to respond to the following questions:

1. Who should score the RFPs?
2. Who should be the key qualifications for a MC?
3. What is the best transition plan for moving from current contracts to MCs?
4. What should be included in the on-site readiness review?

### ***Breakout Group Reports***

Co-chair Judge Leonard Costello welcomed the committee members back from the breakout groups and gave directions for how reports would proceed. The breakout groups elected representatives, Maureen McGrath and Liz Mueller, who then presented summaries of the group discussions.

1. *Who should score the RFP?*

Group 1 suggested:

- The evaluators should be objective and their participation won't create a conflict of interest.
- The review team should have a mix of both academic and child welfare backgrounds
- Reviewers should have background knowledge of:
  - Finance
  - Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA)
  - Braam requirements
  - Racial disproportionality
- Reviewers should have experience delivering social work services
- How many evaluators? "Enough, but not too many."
- Reviewers should be able to represent consumers and understand consumer needs
- Reviewers should have a background of regional needs
- Reviewers should be given clear instruction on purpose of evaluation and should be provided good info regarding the regional needs assessment
- Should maintain inter-rater reliability
- Reviewers should be uninterested in which bidders are chosen
- Serving on the CWTDC shouldn't preclude individuals from scoring bids

Group 2 suggested:

- Subcontractors should be articulated and removed from scoring process
- Reviewers should have background with infrastructure and capacity such as IT and HR
- Review teams could be diversified by recruiting individuals from mental health field, law enforcement, non-profit foundations
- Review teams might want to include peer-reviewers from other states
- Regional Administrators from CA
- Foster youth and alums
- Review teams could be composed of large number of individuals so that individual biases are diminished as they are averaged out
- Review team should have regional knowledge
- Reviewers should operate from a youth-engagement and family engagement perspective
- Review team should have experience with working with the state and with licensing

## 2. *What should be the key qualifications for a MC?*

Group 1 suggested:

- Relationship with service community and other public institutions
- Financial stability
- Experience managing a provider network
- Ability and experience managing outcomes
- Experience implementing practice model and
- Engaging families, community, and children in realizing outcomes
- Adequate technology
- Experience serving diverse populations
- Quality Assurance/Quality Improvement (QA/QI)
- Human Resources

- Wages, hours, working conditions
- Training
- Established governance structure
- Capacity building ability
- Reference checks of master contractors and providers
- Priority should be given to accredited organizations or those organizations actively seeking accreditation
- Knowledge and experience complying with federal and state laws

Group 2 suggested:

- Youth-engagement model and a full description of what it looks like
- Family-engagement model and a full description of what it looks like
- Licensing history with state, both from their perspective and from the state's
- Accreditation
- Solid fiscal management
- Clear indicator and description their cultural competencies with specific populations
- Experience with Evidence-Based Practices
- Prior and present lawsuit history
- Experience with child welfare with respect to the service array that they are presented
- Governorship and board structure
- Salary structure
- Turnover rates of key positions
- Past knowledge and history with other agencies
- History and method of establishing subcontracting rates
- Administrative rates
- Data collection tools
- Reinvestment strategies
- Level of insurance and proof of liability coverage
- Number of people services
- Plan for serving rural and remote areas
- Plan for aftercare
- How to achieve safe and stable permanency
- How long personnel had be in specific positions, and the position titles
- A plan or experience in a 24-7 system
- Experience with producing monthly management reports

Mary Armstrong mentioned that many bidders would not have had first-hand experience with PBC, and so this experience would not be mandatory. Rather, extra points would be awarded to bidders with this type of experience.

### 3. *What is the best transition plan for moving from current contracts to MCs?*

Group 1 suggested:

- Service development and capacity building plan
- Flexibility around timeframes
- Minimized disruption to children and families
- Plan to bring on subcontractors and other community services
- Plan to integrate foster parents, relative caregivers, and group home providers
- A four-year first round

Group 2 suggested:

- Bidders should bear the largest workload in implementing the transition plan
- Principles should be involved
- Inclusion of parent, youth, and providers are engaged in planning meeting over the life-course of the case
- CA and private agency employees should be trained to be on the “same page”
- Human resources care-coordinators must be identified early in planning stages
- Connecting with courts around disposition plans
- Constituency satisfaction benchmarks
- Making sure that there is adequate time to complete all stages of the implementation
- Graduation at a piecemeal pace
- IT portion must be up and actualized
- Process must be very clear for legacy cases
- Guidelines so that statutory requirements are followed
- HR must be in place

Charlotte McCullough added that the second group considered a hypothetical scenario whereby a new collaboration of entities formed to submit a single bid. She said that the transition plans within proposals are likely to be different between such a case and a single established agency. She feels that the reviewers should be flexible in these situations to accept different types of bids so that there would be an equal playing field.

#### 4. *What should be included in the on-site readiness review?*

Group 1 suggested:

- All qualification in the RFP should be attained
- Meeting objective in approved transition plan
- State data capacity is ready
- State contract management capacity is ready
- State has identified needed resources
- Quality assurance capacity is ready

Group 2 suggested:

- Facilities, physical locations and accessibility to communities in need are all verified
- Full complement of staff
- QA/QI system in place
- Risk management system in place
- Solid fiscal systems
- Revenues to support organization during ramp-up period
- Operational IT systems
- Insurance coverage
- Locations for all providers
- Subcontractors in place
- Conflict resolution procedure
- Critical incidents response policy
- Test drive of 24/7 response
- Memo's of understanding
- Background checks of staff

Mary Armstrong added that the readiness assessment should also be applied to the regional CA offices.

### ***Public Comment***

Fred Gold, private citizen, commented on something Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson mentioned earlier in the day regarding the possibility that exclusionary criteria for children and youth with extraordinary needs would be incorporated in the contract. If this happens, he believes the exclusionary criteria must be clearly defined and administered so that high needs youth are neither denied services nor forced upon a master contractor to the point where the MC is adversely impacted financially.

### ***Meeting Wrap-Up and Q&A with Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson***

Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson answered a few questions that were raised over the course of the day. She announced that there will be a few changes made to her presentation in response to CWTDC input over the course of the day. The first change she agreed to make was Sharon Osborne's request for eight full weeks to draft proposals after the RFP is released. She also mentioned that there would be a separate meeting on BRS services hosted in the very near future. She emphasized that the authentic voices of the parents, the children and the older youth need to lead the discussion on service needs and CA will continue to work on getting this specific input.

Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson offered to take few moments to talk about issues facing private providers that still need clarity or more information.

- Mark Courtney spoke first about the capacity of the public agency to implement the changes contained in Part 1 of 2SHB 2106. He asked what Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson needs in order to successfully implement all the necessary changes, particularly within CA. She said that the biggest challenge is that CA is not currently structured to pay for performance, but that they are working to provide information internally and also make real changes with regard to knowledge, skills and abilities to implement the legislation. Some of these changes will arise out of the rearranging of quality assurance staff. She wants to make sure that there is trust on both sides and encouraged everyone to continue to offer input and to work together to ensure that families and children get what they need. Ultimately, she feels that is "possible to do it, and it is probable that it will be done."
- Kara Sanders of the Mockingbird Society asked what will happen if the MC is not fulfilling their obligations in their partnership with CA and what measures will be in place to ensure that the MC is getting what they need to make sure that outcomes are achieved. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson said that this process starts with trust, but that roles are clarified. She added that there would be dispute resolution mechanisms to prevent and deal with issues before they cause serious problems.
- Catherine Lanham asked how recruitment, retention and support of foster and adoptive families will be handled.
- Mary Armstrong commented on the issue brought up by Kara Sanders about how it will become apparent if the partnership between CA and private contractors is faltering. She suggested that this could be determined by asking children and families if their needs are being met. She also said that the performance indicators would identify when these partnerships are not working smoothly.
- Liz Mueller asked how coordination with different agencies will be conducted. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson said that the leadership of DSHS agencies are talking about

this. She cited a recent example of meetings held between JRA and CA. She said that this is something that is recognized to be important and that they are working on it.

- Wendy Tanner of Community Youth Services requested that CA expedite the process of providing critical data to service providers interested in bidding on a MC contract; e.g., number of youth, number of families, services, and QA/QI surveys. Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson asked for some specific examples. Wendy Tanner said that she could formulate a list of items. Charlotte McCullough added that this situation is not uncommon for states implementing PBC and further applauds the state and POC for conducting the needs assessment over the summer.
- Jeanine Livingston asked about the source and amount of philanthropic dollars so that everyone is aware of the current budget.
- Sharon Osborne asked for more clarification on the goals and the scope of the needs assessment, particularly if the assessment looks both at the private vendors but also internal CA. She added that the assessment should also look not just at the gaps, but also the strengths. Julie Dunnington said that the assessment is still in the early stages of the design process, but that everyone will have access to the information.
- Maureen McGrath requested that in light of the current budgetary constraints, the CWTDC-developed service array be given priority so that vendors vying for a MC contract have a more clear idea of which services are most important. Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson said that CA desired those that are federally and state mandated. Ian Grant recommended that the CWTDC use the *Principles and Values* document to guide this prioritization.
- Ian Grant suggested that this is a good opportunity to restructure the grievance policy in a way that is more user-friendly for consumers.

### ***Closing Comments for Day 1***

Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson said that she is hoping to get a little more detail on infrastructure needs before the quarterly meeting concludes. Co-chair Judge Leonard Costello thanked committee members for their participation and gave a brief overview of the logistics for the second day of the meeting.

**JUNE 15, 2010**

***Welcome and Introductions***

Judge Costello welcomed all the committee members and briefed the committee on the meeting's logistics.

***Outcomes and Evaluation Issues Advisory Committee Report***

Advisory Committee Co-Chair Ken Nichols, CA Regional Administrator, Region 2 and Partners for Our Children Research Director Mark Courtney gave an update on this committee's progress. Ken Nichols reviewed the advisory committee's responses to the suggestions for revisions submitted by the CWTDC during the March quarterly meeting. The goal for the day was to vote and accept the *Domains and Indicators Used to Determine Outcomes* document. Both presenters reported that the Advisory Committee felt their work was complete. Committee members will attend other Advisory Committee meetings, as appropriate. Through consensus, co-chair Judge Leonard Costello announced that the *Domains and Indicators Used to Determine Outcomes* document was adopted.

***Site Selection and Transition Issues Advisory Committee Report***

Advisory Committee co-chairs Nancy Sutton, CA Region 5 Administrator, and Jeanine Livingston, WA Federation of State Employees, presented a progress update. An important item was that the deadline for site selection for Part 2 was extended. The new deadline is September. The Advisory Committee decided to wait to make a recommendation on demonstration sites until more information was available. The Advisory Committee has also begun to compile a list of issues that needs additional consideration.

After the presentation, Judge Costello opened up the floor to questions:

- Ian Grant asked if the advisory committee planned to not break up school districts in anticipation of a hypothetical future data sharing collaboration.
- Maureen McGrath cautioned the advisory committee to ensure that sites were scaled large enough to be cost-feasible for potential bidding contractors.
- Nancy Foll asked Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson if there is any more information about whether the existing six administrative regions will be broken down during Part 1 implementation. No decision from CA has been decided.
- Maureen McGrath said that she hopes the selection of sites should wait until a concurrent pilot project culminates before proceeding with another pilot project that could potentially confound results.
- Judge Costello asked if the advisory committee is going to bring forward a single site proposal for each side of the state or multiple proposals. Nancy Sutton said that the advisory committee would likely present two alternatives for each side of the state.

***Financial Issues Advisory Committee Report***

Advisory Committee co-chairs Carole Holland, Senior Budget Assistant to the Governor, Office of Financial Management, and Sharon Osborne, CEO, Children's Home Society of Washington, presented a progress update. The committee discussed data systems, infrastructure, and start-up costs for private providers and will work with the Children's Administration finance group closely to understand development of the Performance Based Contracting financial model to assist in informing the Part 2 financial model. They cautioned everyone to be very creative with regards to financing the infrastructure needs because there would be no additional resources to infuse into this process.

After the presentation, Judge Costello opened up the floor to questions:

- Maureen McGrath mentioned a rumor about specific services being carved out of the service array. She stated that any such carve out would limit the ability of MCs to be innovative. Carole Holland agreed.

### ***Legal and Practice Advisory Committee Report***

Advisory Committee co-chairs Judge Chris Wickham, Thurston County Superior Court, and the Hon. Liz Mueller, IPAC Chair, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe, presented a progress update. The Advisory Committee incorporated CWTDC recommendations/changes to three documents: *Principles and Values to Determine Core Services*, *Preliminary Service Array*, and *Service Array Definitions* and have agreed to common definitions for *Evidence-Based and Promising Practices*.

Judge Wickham reported that the Advisory Committee formulated a list of questions that was submitted (with the assistance of Senator Hargrove) to the Attorney General for an informal opinion. Judge Wickham announced that they already received a response and summarized some of the key points.

Steve Hassett, a member of the Legal and Practice Advisory Committee and an Assistant Attorney General, explained the questions that were posed were not all of the legal questions compiled by the advisory committee, just those that were “threshold” questions that needed immediate clarification. Ultimately, he said, the issues around liability would need to be clarified in the contract process; e.g., coverage, level of coverage, etc. He also described issues arising from Washington being a “joint and several liability” state.

After the slide that mentioned the inquiry submitted to the Solicitor General, Judge Costello opened up the floor to questions:

- Judge Costello asked about the likelihood that we might see a waiver of “sovereign immunity” removed. Steve Hassett said that the likelihood is nil.
- He then asked if the legislature might place a liability cap on awarded damages. Steve Hassett said that the likelihood is slim because there is a supreme court case that said that placing a liability cap infringes upon a jury’s ability to award damages.
- Mary Armstrong asked if the issue of liability is an issue for MCs or if it is an issue for the supervising agency in Part 2. Steve Hassett said it is an issue for both Parts.
- Ian Grant asked about a “risk pool.” Steve Hassett said that a risk pool might be one way to solve aspects liability issues.
- Sharon Osborne asked whether the advisory committee will be investigating some of the legal issues in greater depth, particularly the issue of the insurance coverage. Judge Wickham said that the letter from the Solicitor General is only the beginning, but that they will take up some of these issues at the next advisory committee meeting.
- Mark Courtney commented that he is certain that there are other states where private organizations perform exactly what is being asked in Washington State.
- Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson said that when the RFP is released, it would be able to address issues such as liability insurance.
- Carole Holland stated that OFM has responsibility for risk management for the state and there was a meeting where the resolution was that they would explore into insurance options.
- Jeanine Livingston encouraged the CWTDC to work with the Insurance Commissioner’s Office because they maintain a list of carriers and rates.

- Asst. Secretary Revels Robinson asked how insurance agencies will insurance agencies view the new contractual arrangements under Part 1 versus existing contractual arrangements for child welfare services.
- Mary Armstrong suggested the CWTDC look into the National Resource Center on Legal and Judicial Issues as they explore legal issues.

When the presentation continued, the conversation shifted to the documents prepared by the advisory committee that need approval before being submitted to the legislature and CA. Judge Costello opened up the floor to objections or concerns regarding the latest versions of the documents. The full committee had an extended discussion on whether the services contained in the service array are considered core services.

Judge Costello called for vote on whether to adopt the additional recommendations from the Legal and Practice Advisory Committee. There were 20 votes for and 5 votes against so the additional recommendations from the advisory committee were accepted by the CWTDC.

The CWTDC suggested a couple minor revisions to clarify the committee's intent within the documents. These changes will be reflected in the next drafts of the documents. Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson suggested that the list of core services be cross-referenced with the services required or funded by federal and state law. Chris Wickham felt strongly that the prioritized list of services should be completed by a group of individuals with the knowledge of current budgetary limitations.

Representative Ruth Kagi said that the legislature should have a conversation around how services are funded in the legislature. She said that she would begin this conversation with her staff and other legislators.

Next, the committee took a brief break before embarking on a discussion on the definition for Evidence-Based Practices. When the committee reconvened, Judge Wickham explained the purpose of this discussion and summarized the goals for the meeting. Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson requested that the definition add a caveat to the beginning of the document that this definition applies only to child welfare. The CWTDC agreed to accept the California Clearinghouse definition for Evidence-Based and Promising Practices.

### ***Public Comment***

Charles Shelan, Executive Director for Community Youth Services, thanked Asst. Secretary Denise Revels Robinson and Mark Courtney for their involvement in this process. He commented that he hoped that CWTDC recommend to the legislature that indemnification be extended to MCs. He also requested that bidding organizations be offered a draft copy of the contract. Lastly, he implored the committee to consider a robust strategy to fund the infrastructure ramp-up for MCs.

Jim Theofelis of the Mockingbird Society said that he views that street youth as a core part of the demographics the system should seek to serve.

### ***Items to be Included in Children's Legislative Oversight Committee Report***

Co-chair Leonard Costello summarized the purpose of the report to the Children's Legislative Oversight Committee Report. Mark Courtney recounted the earlier discussion around street youth and feels that the CWTDC must make some explicit policy decisions before the service array is handed to MCs. Sharon Osborne said that she hopes that the CWTDC takes a strong stand on the importance of the flexibility of child welfare dollars.

***Next Steps***

Julie Dunnington talked about future scheduling changes to the CWTDC. She recommended that after the September quarterly CWTDC, meetings occur monthly but only for a single, full day rather than two.

CWTDC will now be meeting in University of Washington – Tacoma.