

Join Hands for Children
Minutes of the Site Selection Advisory Committee Meeting
May 13, 2010
1:00 pm to 4:00 pm

Present: David Del Villar Fox, Julie Dunnington, Trudy Marcellay, Gwen Gua, Beth Canfield, Jeanine Livingston, Nancy Sutton, Mark Courtney, Carrie Hoon, Jennifer Strus, Nathan Johnson, Stephanie Lee, Marna Miller, Joe Mienko, Alia Griffing, Marilyn Deatrck, Children's Home Society; Maureen McGrath (by phone)

David Del Villar Fox announced that he is assuming facilitation of the internal CA groups and working with POC on the various meetings of the advisory committees as well as the TDC. He updated the group on the Legislative Children's Oversight Committee meeting held on May 12. Based upon the conversation with the Oversight Committee, it was decided that September rather than June is the new deadline for the selection of the demonstration sites. Phase I is being more clearly defined by Children's Administration (CA) and the focus is on the Master Contractor (MC) providing a continuum of care rather than discrete services for specific populations (the buckets). The current goal is to have one to two MCs in each DSHS region.

Julie also discussed the Oversight Committee meeting. The MC is responsible for full continuum of services, knowing that the MC cannot do all the services itself. If there are multiple MCs in a region then the region would be broken into specific catchment areas for the MCs. The intent is that the MCs would be a one-stop shopping venue for social workers – the social worker works with the care coordinator in the MC to design the service plan and obtain the appropriate services for the child and family. The MC works with all social workers in their catchment area.

Julie also reported that POC is doing an assessment of all the providers across the state this summer and the site selection committee might want to wait to have this information before deciding on the location of the demonstration sites. The totality of the assessment is not yet decided – it probably will look at gaps in services, a provider's readiness to be a MC or participate with an MC, to name a couple of items. Julie will keep the committee informed of the development of the assessment and time lines related to the assessment.

Mark pointed out that the distribution of MCs in regions will be helpful in determining the location of the demonstration sites. Jeanine stated that she is not sure that where the services are is that germane to the sites' selection of the demonstration site.

Mark indicated that he is concerned with overlapping – if there are a small number of cases in the MC catchment area – there needs to be enough overlap in case manager function and MC catchment area to evaluate. He also pointed out that the MCs must be able to work statewide because parents and kids move and can be placed in other parts of the state where the originating MC does not have a contract. It could be that the work of the site selection committee is premature in light of the later development of the MC.

David indicated that CA is creating working drafts for the RFP for Phase I so that they can begin discussions with stakeholders. A skeletal outline of the RFP and the contract would be provided to tribes, and others would provide input. State law prohibits CA from sharing the totality of the RFP before it's issued but they have the ability to work with stakeholders up to a certain point under state law and they plan to take advantage of that.

Mark indicated that the committee probably should not get into what the site map should look like without being farther along in the development of the MC in Phase I. If the MCs are selected along regional lines then the sites might want to be contained in a region without crossover into other regions – but until the MC catchment areas are decided, the selection of the sites should probably wait.

Jeanine stated that in the June report to the legislature this issue should be mentioned. Perhaps the deadline for Phase II should be extended until some of the details of Phase I are worked out.

Julie pointed out that an updated time line from CA with Phase I and II overlapping would be very helpful.

Nancy suggested that the committee discuss many of the transition issues still ahead and put aside the site selection issue at this point. By the time assessment is done and MC framework is complete, the selection of the sites could be very easy.

The committee decided to cancel the June 10th meeting.

Regarding the committee's presentation to the TDC at the TDC quarterly meeting, the committee decided to explain that it needs to wait until the RFP for the MCs is more fleshed out and there is more information about the assessment before it can proceed with its demonstration site selection recommendations.

There are maps on the website that will not be used to determine the demonstration sites anymore. The committee decided to have a banner placed on the maps explaining that the maps were developed for discussion purposes only and are no longer being used.

Nancy indicated that CA is pulling raw data out of FamLink before June 10th – family counts – to share with the TDC. Lee Doran and Matt Orme are working on it. To be used to rework the maps with current data rather than relying on January 2009 data.

Joe asked whether the identification and recruitment of foster homes are part of the MCs responsibility. The issue has not been decided yet.

TRANSITION ISSUES

How does the hand-off for existing cases happen and what can we do in the transition period to make sure that it happens smoothly?

RANDOM ASSIGNMENT

Joe suggested that one way random assignment could work is at end of the investigation, the social worker inputs into FamLink that the family should go to services and an algorithm could be developed to place the case into a random assignment process.

There will be a need for technical consultation with CA IT folks at some point. There are decision points that need to be discussed first. This is an issue that should be placed in the “parking lot.”

The committee discussed the cases in which there is a tribal-only payment and how those situations would be handled regarding random assignment. There are situations in which kids are under tribal court jurisdiction but the state is paying for services. There are a number of times where the tribal SW and the state SW work cases together. There are a number of cases where all the state does is facilitate payment but no state SW is involved. Those cases where state is doing some case management would seem to be subject to random assignment. If CA has placement care and authority for the child, then the case would go to the random assignment process. For tribal payment only, those cases stay with the state and would not be part of the random assignment process.

What if the department does not have placement and care authority but has provided services in the past. What would happen in those cases re: random assignment?

The Committee decided that it would be helpful to find out from CA IT what the volume of ICWA kids is on the caseload where CA is providing services, and how many cases are payment-only. Hard to get a handle on it without this information. Carrie, Gwen, Trudy, David will be involved in obtaining this information and working

on a recommendation about what to do with these cases. Julie will pull this group together.

CA has not said it is planning to provide different services for tribes.

Trumps from random assignment (cases that ordinarily would be randomly assigned that are not)– sibling groups so they can be managed by either the state or private but not managed by 2 different caseworkers. This issue should be discussed with the FamLink folks as well.

Nancy asked the question – if a child is returned to care after being returned home, at what point does the case go back into the hopper for random assignment. Mark – part of the answer is how you structure the PBC. For example, one way to structure the PBCs is to say once you have had the case you get it again if it comes back into the system. You could build this into Phase I – once you have the kid, if they come back you get them again and may not get paid for it depending on the reason the kid was in the system.

Random assignment conditions: siblings stay together; once assigned stays with that provider; under what circumstances would the assignment be reviewed? Continuity for the family. Assignments reviewed by CA, private provider and WSIPP at the beginning so that they can figure out potential issues. When trump decision is made, WSIPP needs to be notified by appropriate documentation in FamLink. The reason for the trump needs to be noted in FamLink as well.

Future Meeting Dates (Locations to be Announced)

7/22/2010 – 9:30 – 12

8/19/2010 – 1:30 to 4:30

9/16/2010 – 1:30 to 4:30

10/21/2010 – 1:30 to 4:30

11/10/2010 – 1:30 to 4:30