

CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL
Discussion Highlights
September 2, 2015

I. Call to Order and Introductions

Justice Raye and Undersecretary Wilkening extended a personal welcome to Council members, and Justice Raye announced that the Council has one new member: Lisa Bates, Deputy Director, Housing and Policy Development Division, California Department of Housing and Community Development. Undersecretary Wilkening then called on members of the Council and others in attendance to introduce themselves.

II. Approval of the June 3, 2015 Discussion Highlights (Action Item)

Justice Raye asked for comments or suggested revisions to the June 3, 2015 Child Welfare Council Discussion Highlights. There being none, they were approved on a consensus vote.

III. Approval of the 2014-15 Annual Report (Action Item)

Justice Raye introduced the Annual Report as an excellent summary of the impressive amount of work the Council had taken on over the past year and called on Sylvia to provide an overview of the report. Sylvia thanked the Committee and Task Force Chairs for submitting material which served as the basis of the content. Justice Raye asked for questions or amendments. Judge Edwards noted that on page 13 the number of Drug Courts in California should have been 32, not 39. There were no other changes, and the report was adopted on a consensus vote with the one correction.

IV. Update on the Children's Data Network

Undersecretary Wilkening called on Dr. Emily Putnam-Hornstein, Co-Director of the Children's Data Network at the University of Southern California School of Social Work, to talk about the work of the Children's Data Network and its success in integration of administrative data sets to produce valuable information to guide policy and practice.

PRESENTATION

The Children's Data Network is a university, agency, and community collaborative focused on the integration and application of data to inform programs and policies for children and their families. The Children's Data Network is funded by First 5 LA and receives additional support from the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation. It is housed at USC's School of Social Work and includes a partnership with the California Child Welfare Indicators Project at U.C. Berkeley.

The Children's Data Network was formed to address the problem described below:

- Each year, government, foundations, and private agencies across throughout California invest significant resources in programs serving the children and families, including the collection of data.
- Although each agency collects a tremendous amount of valuable administrative client and case data, there is no formal platform for integrating data to support an agenda of research and evaluation.
- Additionally, with shrinking budgets, agencies have increasingly limited resources and capacity for data analysis and thus are more likely to focus on required reporting rather than "mining" information that may be useful for informing programs and policies.

The Children's Data Network serves a facilitating process; the ultimate authority for the use of the data always resides with individual agency. The research agenda is driven by the involved agencies and funders. The Network supports outcomes and accountability reporting (through a master id) and provides scientific advisors, affiliated researchers, IRB and Agency Board approvals.

CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL
Discussion Highlights
September 2, 2015

Emily explained that linked administrative records provide a rich resource for data-driven policy and program decisions. Yet, integrating data from different public agencies also presents ethical, political, operational, and scientific challenges. Understanding potential hurdles, sharing best practices, and developing a knowledge base can help us to realize the vast potential data linkage holds for improving outcomes for children and families. An informative video of how the challenges are overcome in order to reap the benefits of linked administrative data may be found at: <http://www.datanetwork.org/about-us/>.

The vision of the Children’s Data Network is to move from its current “proof of concept” to the establishment of “standard operating procedures,” and finally to transitioning the work to public agencies, such as has been done in Western Australia and Denmark.

| Near-term | Medium-term | Long-term |
|--|--|--|
| <i>“Proof of concept” projects through individual agency data sharing agreements with Children’s Data Network.</i> | <i>Establishment of universally agreed upon “standard operating procedures” for working with already linked, de-identified data.</i> | <i>Transition into public agency body (possibly?); this is the model implemented in Western Australia and Denmark.</i> |

Included in the meeting packets were examples of reports produced by the Children’s Data Network. All reports may be found on the website: www.datanetwork.org . The Network is committed to the development of the relationships and infrastructure needed to realize the potential of data to improve outcomes for children.

COMMENTS

Patrick Gardner noted that the state is “good at getting data in, not so much at getting it back out.” In other words, interoperability and transparency are lacking. Dr. Putnam-Hornstein said that California Data Network researchers had found openness across the board in working with the Departments of Social Services and Health Care Services on data linkages and that Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight is used to ensure privacy is protected in the link to the University of California. She added that open source software (not proprietary) is being used that is complementary to both departments.

Camille Maben shared that First 5 California, the Department of Education, and the California Health and Human Services Agency have identified common data elements and definitions to allow data sharing regarding education and services for children zero to five. Dr. Putnam-Hornstein commented that what these three agencies have achieved demonstrates how to address a huge challenge and underscores the importance of researchers to work with agency staff because they know and understand their own data.

Dr. Kathryn Icenhower commented that expanding data linkages to include nonprofits and prevention agencies would further increase knowledge and understanding of the efficacy of services. Bill Grimm suggested that areas of study be prioritized with funder and new partners be brought into the network.

Justice Raye asked if there are any U.S. states doing what West Australia and Denmark are doing. Dr. Putnam-Hornstein said she had checked with other states and did not find any examples; all had less transparency than those two countries. The United States is behind in its ability to link data related to child welfare services.

CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL
Discussion Highlights
September 2, 2015

As another example of the value of data networks, Michael Newman provided a “hot-off-the-press” announcement that the California Department of Justice, in partnership with the University of California, Berkeley, was unveiling a state-run website to provide data on law enforcement’s interactions with the public. The database is the culmination of months of work aimed at improving transparency and government accountability after incidents sparked debate across the country on police practices over the last year.

V. Steering Committee Report

Undersecretary Wilkening called on Ken Berrick to report on the recent activities of the newly-reconstituted Steering Committee. Ken reported that the Committee has met twice by conference call and wants to focus on developing a “big agenda” or strategic direction for the Council. The members were scheduled to meet for an hour right after the Council meeting. In addition, the Steering Committee looked at the structure of the Council agendas and is recommending that:

- More time be allowed for the discussion of agenda topics; and
- Committee and Task Force status reports at the end of our meetings be captured in one-page descriptions in order to save time and leave room for discussions. For today’s agenda, two groups volunteered to test out the one-pager idea: the Child Development and Successful Youth Transitions Committee and the Priority Access to Services and Supports Task Force.

The full Council will be kept apprised of results of the afternoon’s discussion. Steering Committee members are:

- **Former foster youth:** Vanessa Hernandez, Policy Coordinator, California Youth Connections
- **Parent:** Leah Davis, Parent Leader, California State Parent Team; Parents Anonymous
- **Foster parent:** Cheryl Rave, Crave Productions
- **Tribal member:** Hon. Claudette White, Judge, Quechan Tribal Court, Fort Yuma Indian Reservation
- **Nonprofit service provider:** Ken Berrick, Founder, President and CEO, Seneca Family of Agencies
- **Nonprofit advocate:** Patrick Gardner, Founder and Director, Young Minds Advocacy Project
- **County Child Welfare:** Lori Cox, Director, Alameda County Social Services Agency
- **County Behavioral Health:** Terry Rooney, Ph.D., Director, Colusa County Behavioral Health Services
- **Juvenile Court Judge:** Hon. Shawna Schwarz, Judge, Santa Clara County Juvenile Court
- **State Mental Health:** Karen Baylor, Ph.D., Deputy Director for Mental Health and Substance Use Disorder Services, California Department of Health Care Services
- **State Child Welfare:** Will Lightbourne, Director, California Department of Social Services

VI. California College Pathways

Justice Raye called on Dr. Daniel Webster to introduce the topic and presenters. Daniel introduced Debbie Raucher of the John Burton Foundation, Ken Sorey of the Educational Results Partnership, and Christina Stearns of RTI International, a nonprofit that collaborates with the federal government, states, school districts, and foundations to conduct research and develop policy and strategies to promote individuals’ preparation for both college and career. The California College Pathways project provides resources and leadership to campuses and community organizations to help foster youth succeed at community colleges, vocational schools, and four-year universities. The statewide partnership includes:

- Current and former foster youth scholars
- California Community Colleges
- California State University system (CSU)
- University of California system (UC)
- Campus foster youth support programs
- Foster Youth Success Initiative (FYSI)

CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL
Discussion Highlights
September 2, 2015

- California Department of Social Services
- California Department of Education
- John Burton Foundation (project manager)

The work of California College Pathways is supported by the following funders:

- Stuart Foundation
- Walter S. Johnson Foundation
- Tipping Point Community
- Angell Foundation
- California Wellness Foundation
- Hilton Foundation
- Resilience Foundation
- May and Stanley Smith Foundation

PRESENTATION

When California extended care to college students, the scope of child welfare naturally expanded to include services to college students. By engaging institutions to work together, sharing best practices, and advocating for policies that support foster youth in higher education, California College Pathways is helping foster youth across the state achieve their higher education goals and move on to fulfilling careers by:

- Supporting campus networks of programs for foster youth
- Providing training and technical assistance for emerging and established campus programs
- Advocating for policies and regulations to improve higher education outcomes for foster youth
- Collaborating to create a more seamless pipeline to college for K-12 foster youth

The program focuses on helping foster youth achieve four important milestones: (1) Equip with essential resources; (2) Enroll in college and/or training program; (3) Earn a college degree or certificate; and (4) Embark on a career path. Over a person's lifetime the difference in income between a college graduate and non-college graduate can add up to several hundred thousand dollars. Fastest-growing industries such as health care, education, and business support services require a bachelor's degree or above. Fewer options for those without college degrees now-and there will be even fewer in the future. Occupations losing the most jobs are clerks, cashiers, telemarketers, packagers, and farmers. In addition, there is more competition for jobs that pay less and have less security. Other benefits of higher education include

- Lower incarceration rates
- Improved health outcomes
- Higher levels of civic participation, including volunteer work and voting
- Children more likely to attend college
- Have a vocation – meaningful work

The vision for California College Pathways is: Foster youth in California graduate college ready to thrive in the 21st century workplace at rates equal to, or better than, the general population. The mission is: California College Pathways helps foster youth turn their dreams into degrees by expanding access to college and career opportunities. The goals for 2018 are: (1) 1,000 foster youth in California will earn a college degree or certificate; and (2) Foster youth will achieve important educational milestones at rates equal to, or better than, the general student population.

The strategic framework includes:

CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL
Discussion Highlights
September 2, 2015

- Expand College and Career Pathways: Build strong campus and community networks with effective systems for coordinated action.
- Strengthen Campus and Community Capacity: Provide resources that increase knowledge and capacity to support foster youth.
- Promote Data Informed Decision-Making: Develop an effective shared measurement system that empowers stakeholders to make informed decisions regarding policies, practices, and programs.
- Engage the Expertise of Foster Youth: Create opportunities for foster youth to inform, lead, and build effective educational pathways for all youth in foster care.
- Support Policy Development and Implementation: Advocate for the creation and implementation of policy that supports positive education outcomes for foster youth.

The project is organized into ten networks involving 33 campuses:

Northern Network

- Butte College
- CSU Chico
- Shasta College

Los Angeles Network

- LA City College
- LA Trade Tech
- University of Southern California
- West LA College

Merced Network

- Madera Community College Center
- Merced College
- UC Merced

Bay Area Network

- College of Marin
- CSU San Francisco

Orange County Network

- CSU Fullerton
- Golden West College
- Orange Coast College

North Bay Network

- CSU Sonoma
- Santa Rosa Junior College
- Solano Community College

Central Coast Network

- Cabrillo College
- CSU Monterey Bay
- CSU San Jose
- Hartnell College
- UC Santa Cruz

San Fernando Valley Network

- CSU Northridge
- LA Mission College
- LA Pierce College
- LA Valley College

West LA Network

- Loyola Marymount University
- Santa Monica College
- UC Los Angeles

Riverside Network

- Moreno Valley College
- Riverside City College
- UC Riverside

Highlights of successes to date include:

- Expansion of campus support programs: nine UCs, 21 CSUs, 34 CCCs and 5 private universities.
- Maintaining college access; obtained an exemption for foster youth from new BOG fee waiver and priority registration restrictions.
- Preserving financial aid; obtained favorable federal guidance regarding the impact of AB12 income on financial aid.
- Targeting new funding.
- Inclusion of foster youth in community college equity planning requirements.
- Expanding support; institutionalization of campus support at up to ten community college districts beginning in 2016.
- Improving outcome tracking – Foster youth flag in CCC MIS and CalPASS Plus foster youth data dashboard.

Findings related to educational experiences of foster youth include:

CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL
Discussion Highlights
September 2, 2015

- At Community Colleges a high percentages of all students had their first course in one or more basic skills (math, English, ESL) at the remedial level; 77% of all non-foster youth and 83% of foster youth.
- Among foster youth attending Community College, there was a disparity between the rate of foster youth receiving a BOG waiver fee and a Pell grant despite the fact that if student has financial need sufficient to qualify for BOG Fee waiver, it would likely qualify them for a Pell grant too. Possible reasons for disparity: 1) some foster youth may not filling out the FAFSA (confusing, daunting, etc.); and 2) some may be losing eligibility for Pell due to their grades. Disparity is important, because while BOG covers enrollment fees, it does not cover living expenses like housing, which Pell can cover.
- Foster youth attending Community College are less likely to achieve a 2.0 GPA for the academic year than non-foster youth (49% of foster youth versus 71% of non-foster youth). First year students struggle even more (38% of foster youth versus 61% of non-foster youth).
- Foster youth attending Universities are more likely to need remediation in English and math than non-foster youth (46% versus 25% in English and 43% versus 21% in math).
- Foster youth attending Universities are slightly less likely to achieve a GPA of 2.0 or higher than non-foster youth (88% versus 92%) and less likely to achieve a GPA of 3.0 or higher (36% versus 52%).

The data are limited by the fact that identifying foster youth is complicated and inconsistent. Current sources include some combination of the Chafee Grant Roster, FAFSA application, Foster Youth Support Program, College Application check off box, Priority Registration, and EOP/EOPS. Foster youth do not always self-identify through use of these forms and resources. Most community colleges identify foster youth for MIS solely through self-report on college application, and inaccuracies abound!

Data sharing between college systems and CWS/CMS would enable:

- More accurate tracking of foster youth college outcomes.
- Analysis of college participation for AB 12 participants.
- Better linkage to services.
- Removal of onerous verification requirements.
- Enhanced capacity to plan for needs of population.

The Council's Data Committee is looking at how the Council can play a role in promoting the use of CWS/CMS to identify foster youth attending college. Given that they are adults who can provide consent, data sharing might be easier.

In conclusion, a forthcoming California College Pathways report was announced. Approximately 4800 students flagged as foster youth (current or former) included in community college data and 1100 are included in in university data. The report will be released in Fall 2015 and includes data from 19 community colleges and 12 universities for foster youth attending in the 2012-13 and 2013-14 academic years. The data sources are Cal-PASS Plus foster youth dashboards and individual campuses. The metrics highlight how foster youth are faring in post-secondary education, including the resources accessed (*e.g.*, financial aid, student support programs) and achievement and gaps (*e.g.*, GPA, course completion, persistence).

DISCUSSION

Vanessa Hernandez commented that many foster youth attending college need mental health services and often are not able to access them, and there is a lot left to do to meet this need on campuses. The speakers acknowledged this need, and at this point do not have data to further understanding of the problem. Patrick Gardner asked about success rates for foster youth attending private colleges, which

CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL
Discussion Highlights
September 2, 2015

often require students to take out large student loans. Again, the issue was acknowledged; at this point the project has focused on public colleges and universities.

David Ambroz advocated for moving beyond giving foster youth priority enrollment in higher education to also creating policies for priority hiring by public and private employers, as exemplified by the Santa Clara County employment policy for youth formerly in foster care.

VII. Update on Continuum of Care Reform

Undersecretary Wilkening called on CDSS Director Will Lightbourne to introduce the presentation. Will set the context by reminding Council members of the broad range of child welfare responsibilities, from prevention and early intervention, to in-home family maintenance services, to out-of-home or foster care services. Over the years much attention has been given to the prevention and in-home parts of the continuum, with the additional focus on services to youth placed in foster and group home care over the past five years leading to the Continuum of Care (CCR) statute in 2012 and the anticipated passage of AB 403 which will allow the CCR provisions to be implemented. Implementation is always the hardest part, but the goal of getting youth in foster care the services they need, when they need them, in the right amount remains firm. Will then called on Karen Gunderson to present the highlights of CCR, and Greg Rose to join the discussion. Karen provided the following overview.

PRESENTATION

Background

Legislative mandate for CCR: (Senate Bill 1013 – Chapter 35, Statutes of 2012):

- Reform Group Homes and FFAs with robust and diverse stakeholder input
- Legislative report with recommendations

Continuum of Care Reform: A comprehensive framework that supports children, youth and families across placement settings (from relatives to congregate care) in achieving permanency. Includes:

- Increased engagement with children, youth and families.
- Increased capacity for home-based family care.
- Limited use of congregate care.
- Systemic and infrastructure changes: rates, training, accreditation, mental health services, and accountability and performance,.

Vision

- All children live with a committed, permanent and nurturing family.
- Individualized and coordinated services and supports.
- Focus on permanent family and preparation for successful adulthood.
- When needed, congregate care is a short-term, high quality, intensive intervention that is just one part of a continuum of care available for children, youth and young adults.

Guiding Principles

- The child, youth and family's experience is valued in assessment, service planning and placement decisions.
- Children shouldn't change placements to get services.
- Cross system and cross-agency collaboration to improve access to services and outcomes.
- Recognizing the differing needs of probation youth.

CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL
Discussion Highlights
September 2, 2015

The Paradigm Shift

Group Home → Short-Term Residential Treatment Center (STRTC)

Treatment, not Placement:

Children who cannot be safely placed in a family can receive short-term, residential treatment with specific care plans and intensive therapeutic interventions and services to support transition to a family.

Foster Families → Resource Families

Resource Family Approval:

- Related and non-related families (adoptive, relative/kinship families, and foster families)
- Training for all Resource Families
- Resource Families still choose the role they play in the system: temporary or permanent
- Prepared for permanency-no additional approvals necessary

Resource Families → Permanent Families

The Goal:

Reduction in the number of foster children in congregate care accompanied by an increase in the number of foster children in Resource Families leading to a permanent family through adoption or relative guardianship.

Key Features of Reform

Increased Engagement of Youth, Families and Significant Parties to the Child's Future

- Child & Family Team.
- Up-front and continuing assessment along common domains.
- Aligns with the California Child Welfare Core Practice Model (Statewide Practice Model).

Building Family Care Capacity

- Existing efforts to improve and increase the capacity of home-based family care:
 - Quality Parenting Initiative.
 - Resource Family Approval Process.
 - Approved Relative Caregiver (ARC) Funding Option Program (2014: \$30 million investment).
- Increased Capacity for Home-Based Family Care
 - Resource family approval by counties and FFAs.
 - Additional funding for support, retention, recruitment and training of resource families & relatives (\$21.5 million).
 - Foster Family Agencies provide Core Services that are trauma informed, culturally relevant, and accredited through COA, CARF or JCAHO; they may provide core services to children in county approved families.

Limited Use of Congregate Care

- Transition County Shelters to Temporary Shelter Care.
- Transition Group Homes to Short Term Residential Treatment Centers with Core Services that are trauma informed, culturally relevant, accredited through COA, CARF or JCAHO, and able to transition children to family care by approving resource families.

CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL
Discussion Highlights
September 2, 2015

Core Services

- FFAs and STRTCs make available core services either directly or through formal agreements:
 - Access to specialty mental health services.
 - Transitional support services for placement changes, permanency; aftercare.
 - Education, physical, behavioral and mental health supports.
 - Activities to support youth achieving a successful adulthood.
 - Services to achieve permanency & maintain/establish family connections.
 - Active efforts for ICWA-Eligible children.

Performance Measures and Outcomes

- Evaluate provider performance along specific domains
 - Client satisfaction surveys
 - Public transparency of provider performance

Overarching Elements

- New provider rate structure
 - Sunset RCL system (1-14)
 - Create new STRTC rate
 - Create tiered FFA rate structure
- Multi-year implementation:
 - New requirements take effect 1/1/2017
 - Provisions for extensions up to two years
 - Additional extensions for providers serving probation youth
- STRTC and FFA may be public or Private

The Work Ahead – Will take “a village”! CDSS will be collaborating with a wide array of stakeholders in the implementation work:

| Preparation | Pre-Implementation | Implementation |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies ▪ Rates ▪ Outreach ▪ Orientations ▪ Tools ▪ Training ▪ Accountability ▪ Recruitment ▪ Performance measures | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applications ▪ Reviews ▪ Licenses ▪ Data testing ▪ Training and Technical Assistance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extensions ▪ Data collection ▪ Monitoring ▪ Technical Assistance ▪ Policy Revision |

Effective date for Continuum of Care Reform is January 1, 2017. Questions may be sent to:
ccr@dss.ca.gov.

DISCUSSION

Judge Len Edwards asked if group homes and FFAs would be required to be accredited by January 1, 2017 since accreditation could require agencies to take on considerable work additional costs, especially if they were not currently providing specialty mental health services. Karen responded that CDSS would work with agencies and the accrediting bodies to determine realistic timetables.

CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL
Discussion Highlights
September 2, 2015

Judge Stacy Boulware Eurie stated that group homes could, in effect, end up being used for Probation youth only. Greg Rose responded that because of this concern CDSS was going to work with the Chief Probation Officers of California organization and a few counties to pilot ways to recruit foster families to care for Probation youth as well as to develop approaches to supporting foster and relative families in caring for Probation youth.

Patrick Gardner inquired about strategies contemplated for child welfare collaboration with mental health, stating that he was concerned that it takes a leap of faith to believe it could happen under current practices. Greg responded that AB 403 requires mental health services to be part of Child and Family Teams and use a standardized assessment tool, and that Karen Baylor and her staff were working with Greg and his staff to ensure implementation of the mental health requirements of the bill.

David Ambroz observed that, from a marketing standpoint, "STRTC" (Short-Term Residential Treatment Services) was not a good name and urged those involved in implementing CCR to come up with a better name. David also expressed that he was glad the old Residential Care Level system of funding group homes was going to be phased out.

Ken Berrick offered his appreciation for the extreme complexity of implementing CCR with its requirements for multiple participants working on behalf of each individual child and multi-system collaboration.

VIII. Status Reports from Committees and Task Forces

Justice Raye reminded Council members that, at the suggestion of the Steering Committee, a couple of the committees are going to use a written status report to summarize their activities at this meeting, with the plan to adopt it for all committees at future meetings if Council members agree that this is a good way to communicate updates.

▪ **Prevention/Early Intervention Committee-Statewide Citizen Review Panel (PEI/CRP)**

Dr. Kathryn Icehower reviewed a letter from CDSS Director Will Lightbourne in response to the PEI/CRP's report submitted to the Department for federal fiscal year 2014 (copies included in meeting packets and posted on the Council website under meeting materials). The report focused on two areas: (1) federal child welfare finance reform; and (2) taking promising prevention strategies to scale. The letter in response expressed gratitude for the work of the PEI/CRP and the time and energy dedicated to improving policies and systems for children and families as well as CDSS's commitment to working with the PEI/CRP on the issues going forward. Kathy reported that the PEI/CRP Committee would be forming subcommittees to address the two areas of focus going forward.

▪ **Permanency Committee**

Carol Schroeder and Bob Friend asked Marymichael Miatovich to step forward so that they could acknowledge her considerable support to the committee over the years and announce her resignation from her job with the Judicial Council to accept a position as a researcher with the Santa Clara County Superior Court. Bob also reported that a new round of Family Finding training would be given around the state.

▪ **Child Development and Successful Youth Transitions Committee**

Rochelle Trochtenberg directed Council members' attention to the written report in their packets, which was also posted, summarizing the topics being studied by the committee: Earned Income Tax

CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL
Discussion Highlights
September 2, 2015

Credit; Education; Housing; Supporting Healthy Sexual Development of Youth in Foster Care; and Psychotropic Medications. She then called on Lindsay Gilchrist and Greg Srolestar who are working with a consortium of agencies on a proposed change to the federal EITC policy that would expand eligibility to former foster youth ages 18 to 25 as a strategy for averting homelessness, reducing poverty, and increasing labor market participation (description of the project was also provided in packets and posted).

▪ **Data Linkages and Information Sharing Committee**

Dr. Daniel Webster reported that the committee would be learning about the forthcoming California Health and Human Services Open Data Portal and also would be discussing how extended foster care for transition age youth can provide an opportunity for pregnancy prevention and parenting support, based on the latest integrated administrative data from the Children's Data Network.

▪ **Priority Access to Services and Supports Task Force (PASS)**

Frank Mecca and Dana Blackwell reported that the four Agency Teams (Housing, Workforce, Behavioral Health, and Corrections/Probation) initially brought enthusiasm, commitment, and resources to operationalize priority access within their departments. Along the way some of the anticipated challenges were confirmed: legislative/regulations-based and fiscal resource limitations.

The Agency teams are reporting that there are also limitations in administrative capacity to broaden focus to incorporate priority access. The PASS Leadership team is taking a step back to look at where we are and what it will take to realize the vision of priority access across agencies that are serving the same families and where outcomes in one area impact outcomes for all the other areas.

The basis for the Council's work on priority access is:

Frank and Dana also provided a written document (as a handout and posted) that summarizes what the teams are doing in the meantime:

- The **Behavioral Health Team** has formed a Workgroup comprised of state and county child welfare and Behavioral Health partners that is looking at ways to leverage priority access strategies with existing departmental priorities. For example, DHCS/BH anticipates a federal planning grant starting October 1, 2015 to plan for Community Certified Behavioral Health Centers. This planning effort will incorporate some of the goals and logistics for priority access for FR families.
- The **Housing and Community Development** team is continuing to explore ways to align existing and anticipated resources to better serve parents in reunification. A challenge in this area is working to allow reunification families to be prioritized as a specific high-need population. Lisa Bates has been appointed as a member of the Council and will join starting in December.
- The **Workforce Investment Board** released a 4.2 million grant opportunity, a portion of which had the potential to be directed to explore effective strategies for assisting parents in reunification with employment. Unfortunately there were few proposals in this area, and none were funded. The WIB has completed its commitment to PASS.
- The **Corrections/Probation Team** postponed their forum to invite input from community and parent partners due to administrative capacity limitations. More to follow in December.

▪ **Out-of-County Mental Health Task Force**

Dr. Karen Baylor reported that AB 1299, the legislation proposing a solution to the out-of-county mental health issue was unexpectedly placed on the Suspense File. The administration has a plan to work with

CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL
Discussion Highlights
September 2, 2015

the author to make it a two year bill and to hold a meeting with the many stakeholders involved before the Legislature reconvenes in January.

▪ **Ending Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) Action Team**

Leslie Heimov reported that the Action Team was ready to work with the CSEC Program's "Tier 2" Counties upon announcement by CDSS within the next week or so. The focus of the Action Team's work in the afternoon would be to plan for next year's work in three areas of focus:

- ✓ Create a "Survivor Council" – determine structure, expectations, potential professional development/capacity building needs and identify organizations that can help with professional development
- ✓ Pre-workshop at the "Beyond the Bench" Conference – review draft of presentations and identify additional factors and challenges that need to be addressed as part of the preparation
- ✓ Action Team learning opportunities and trainings - identify presentations/trainings that would be useful for AT members at meetings.

Leslie also announced that Maheen Kaleem, an attorney and Equal Justice Works Fellow at Rights 4 Girls, would be making a presentation followed by a discussion at the Action Team meeting that afternoon. Ms. Kaleem has extensive experience working with system-involved youth and their families, with a particular focus on sexually exploited youth. She served as the first-responder for Alameda County's pilot program for Sexually Abused and Commercially Exploited Youth/Safe Place Alternative initiative, where she worked with over 350 CSEC victims. Her work with youth includes teaching, crisis intervention and response, legal representation, and organizing. In addition she has worked on a number of youth issues including ending the practice of trying youth as adults, stopping school push-out, and addressing the educational needs of formerly incarcerated youth.

IX. Public Comment and Adjournment to Committee Meetings

Gail Johnson Vaughn added comments to the presentation on Continuum of Care Reform. She congratulated the administration on a job well done and also shared that she had had a conversation with CDSS leadership to stress the importance of extending the scope of foster family agencies to include Permanency services so that child-centered, specialized permanency service that address the child's history of trauma, separation and loss are available to all foster youth who need them. These services will include mental health services provided by therapists knowledgeable about the experiences of children in foster care and could also include targeted strategies in family finding and engagement practices.

Gail also shared her concern that, as a member of the CCR Program Committee, she heard comments to the effect that permanency for older youth is impossible. She emphasized that in her experience, not only is permanency possible, but probable. She also reminded the Council that securing permanent families for youth in foster care also saves money in the long run.

There being no further public comment, Justice Raye and Undersecretary Wilkening thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting.