

COMMISSION TO STUDY RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN	
MEETING MINUTES FORM	
GROUP MEETING: Commission to Study Residential Placement of Children	MEETING DATE: June 7, 2007
Members Present: Martha Yeager Walker, Secretary/Chair; Jason Najmowski, Bureau for Children and Families; Frank Andrews, WV Department of Education; Andrea Darr, WV Prosecuting Attorneys Institute; John Bianconi, Bureau for Behavioral Health & Health Facilities; Matthew Kittle, WV Department of Education; O.C. Spaulding, Circuit Court Judge, Putnam Co.; Pat Winston, Bureau for Medical Services	
Members Absent: Steve Canterbury, WV Supreme Court of Appeals; John Hutchison, Circuit Court Judge, Raleigh County; Phillip Morrison, WV Prosecuting Attorneys Institute; Steven L. Paine, WV Department of Education; Jane Charnock-Smallridge, Family Court Judge, 11 th District; Jack Alsop, Circuit Court Judge, Webster Co.; Lynn Boyer, WV Department of Education; Pam Cain, WV Department of Education; Dale Humpheys, Division of Juvenile Services; Gary Johnson, Circuit Court Judge, Nicholas Co.; and Mike Lacy, WV Supreme Court of Appeals.	
Staff/Guests: Carl Hadsell, WVU Center for Entrepreneurial Studies & Development; Sue Hage, Bureau for Children and Families; Jeanette Rowsey, WV System of Care; Scott Boileau, Alliance for Children; Linda Dalyai, Bureau for Children and Families; Jacob Green, WV Department of Education; Laurel Haught, Region II Family Resource Network; Melanie Swisher, Bureau for Children and Families; Susan Fry, Stepping Stones; Jerry Roueche, Department of Health and Human Resources, Secretary's Office; Rocco Fucillo, Office of the Attorney General; Jennifer Britton, APS Healthcare; Caroline Duckworth, APS Healthcare; Laura Sperry, Bureau for Children and Families; Jane McCallister, Bureau for Children and Families; Barbara Recknagel, Braley & Thompson, Inc.; Linda Watts, WV System of Care; Jackie Payne, Office of Behavioral Health Services; Dave Majic, Office of Behavioral Health Services; John Bumgarner and Paul DiLorenzo, National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement; Donna McComas, Bureau for Children and Families.	
KEY POINTS DISCUSSED	
1. Welcome and Introductions Secretary Walker called the meeting to order.	
2. Updates from Last Meeting a. Review and Approval of March 7, 2007 Minutes Secretary Walker skipped the approval of the minutes of the March 7, 2007 meeting as there was not a quorum of Commission members present.	
b. McKinney/Vento Update - Matt Kittle, with the Department of Education, in collaboration with the Department of Health and Human Resources are coming to a consensus on classification of homeless children in compliance of the McKinney/Vento Act. Currently, the proposal has been sent to the Deputy Superintendent and State Superintendent for their review and/or recommended revisions. Matt stated that they anticipate that this will be completed this summer after review and approval by the WV State Board of Education. He said he will be able to present this information to the Commission in September.	
c. APS Healthcare Survey (Resource Results) - Jennifer Britton and Caroline Duckworth of APS Healthcare, Inc. provided the results of the APS Healthcare Provider Survey.	
<p>APS Healthcare, Inc. conducted this second statewide Provider Network Survey which identifies system capabilities and needs in order to enhance the quality and availability of behavioral health services in West Virginia. APS Healthcare began distributed the provider surveys by electronic means in August 2006 to gather data for calendar year 2005.</p> <p>Sixty-one (61) Licensed Behavioral Health Centers (LBHC) and one hundred eight-two (182) Private Practice Groups (PP) received information on how to access the survey. Forty-six (46) LBHC and forty-eight (48) PP responded to the survey. Three (3) LBHC were not eligible to complete the survey while</p>	

twelve (12) did not respond. Forty-one (41) LBHC and eighteen (18) PP completed all or most of the survey. It was noted that 67 licensed behavioral health providers that are registered, don't all participate with APS, 61 do, some of the private practitioners are group practices, and their data is consolidated.

The information presented included only the specific data graph that relates to issues the Commission is trying to resolve.

The DHHR Commissioners and Contract Managers also received a copy of the results. This survey is completed every three years as part of APS Healthcare's contract with DHHR for the three Bureaus. The scope of the work is to try and determine the strength of the provider network in West Virginia, the capabilities of the providers, and where there are gaps in services. This information is analyzed to recommend improvements for service development and delivery for all citizens in West Virginia.

During a discussion regarding youth "waiting" on placements, Judge Spaulding commented that typically these youth will be placed in shelter care, but many could be sent home (giving the parents Physical Custody) on a temporary basis. However, if a youth returns home, IV-E funding would not pay for services even if the state maintains Legal Custody. He further commented that "the system makes us take a child out of the home prematurely, put him/her in a child shelter, spend money, while we wait for two months to place the child in a facility. Jason Najmulski agreed, stating that in the last IV-E review, this kind of situation was pointed out as an on-going problem, one that needs to be changed.

Secretary Walker requested a list of those providers who did/did not participate for future reference.

Handouts of the presentation were provided to each member and a copy (manual) of the data results were available for review. Refer to the handout, "Provider Network Survey" for additional information.

d. National Children's Summit - Sue Hage gave a brief update on the National Children's Summit, which she, Judge Johnson, Chief Justice Robin Davis, and Nicki Tennant of the Supreme Court Administrative Office attended in New York this past March. The National Children's Summit was a follow-up an earlier Summit which was held in Minneapolis, MN in the fall of 2006. Of the participants that attended, there were 16 state chief justices, 24 state court administrators, 15 human service secretaries/deputy secretaries, 25 child protection agency directors/senior officials, in addition to trial judges, CIP directors, advocates, etc. There were 42 states represented, District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico.

The preliminary sessions included focused on how to collaborate between courts and agencies to provide services to meet the needs of the children and families, approaches to strategic planning, and different initiatives that are taking place in several states. The Summit also offered various problem solving workshops. Additionally, each jurisdiction, was given time to get together to continue working on a strategic plan that was started at the earlier Summit in New York. Sue, Chief Justice Davis and Judge Johnson were particularly impressed that West Virginia, unlike some states, was working together very well. They hope to incorporate the strategic plan, developed in Minneapolis, into the initiatives of the Court Improvement Program.

3. Developing Benchmarks for Measurements

Carl Hadsell noted that at the last meeting, the Commission discussed the need for benchmarks to measure progress. Information and handouts on Foster Care Placements and Out of Home Education Attainment and Achievement were presented for consideration for benchmarks and projected outcomes.

a. Foster Care Placements – A handout, with data on foster care placements was provided to Commission members. The first page of this handout "West Virginia Foster Care Placement on 03/31/2007" provides the number of children/youth in specific "Type of Care Provided" and the "Group Residential Care Breakdown". The second page provides a graph that depicts both the number of children/youth in "Foster Care Placements" for each month and if placements was in-state or out-of-state for the time frame between

March 2006 through March 2007.

One of the goals of the Commission was to decrease the number of children placed out of state, this shows that the work is heading in the right direction. A second handout/graph provides information on projected outcomes for the Commission to consider. This graph shows both the information from the previous handout (benchmark) and both the proposed outcomes of Out-Of-State Placement, depicted by the yellow line and Overall Placement Reduction, depicted by a red horizontal line. Both the Out-Of-State Placement (yellow line) and the Overall Placement Reduction (red line) are suggested outcomes for the Commission to consider as a starting point. In an earlier discussion, the Commission determined that in-state placements may include placements that are within "50 miles from the West Virginia state border". This would need to be factored in when looking at outcomes for reductions in Out-of-State Placements.

Furthermore, there are situations in which only a few children/youth have a specific treatment need that to do so in-state would be too expensive to do for one or two people.

Sue Hage also noted that a couple of out-of-state facilities are considered as "part of the community". Additionally, if we are looking at what is in the best interest of the children, consideration would need to include where resources are available and the closest proximity to their home. This is extremely important in reunification and permanency planning.

It was further noted that as we continue to develop capacity, the need for using a number of these out-of-state facilities may be reduced. For instance, we may need to consider how we are using our in-state facilities, possibly reconfiguring the programming and treatment being offered by in-state facilities, we may increase both the capacity for in-state facilities and serve children/youth in their own homes.

The Regional Clinical Teams will provide us with more detailed data, in addition to what we are currently getting with the out-of-state reports.

b. Education Attainment and Achievement Gaps in Out of Home Placement – A Memorandum of Understanding has occurred between the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Resources which includes the commitment to continue looking at academic achievement gaps, increased prevalence of disability, and the rates of discipline occurrences for foster children placed in WV, and the percent of foster care students not attending the same school for the full academic year as these were all found to be associated with out of home children. A document was passed around that depicts the above information (graphs and tables) and a comparison of information from the original 2003-2004 report (Reaching Every Child) with the same data for 2005-2006. This type of data will help monitor success in terms of moving toward the Commission's goals related to education and reducing the number of children in placements. At the Commission's request, they are putting together some actual data that is being monitored.

c. Other – Carl asked the Commission members if there is any other data that they would like to see or have developed.

4. Judges Survey

a. Purpose – The Judges Survey was requested by members of the Commission to better understand the service capacity and availability in local communities with regards to youth who are formally involved in the Court System

An electronic copy of the draft survey was projected for the Commission members to review. This survey will provide a mechanism for the Commission to better understand the service capacity and availability in the local communities with regards to youth who are formally involved in the Court System.

The draft survey was faxed to the circuit judges that are members of the Commission. They were asked

to provide feedback on the draft survey. The summary paragraph (currently on the survey) that summarizes what we hope to accomplish, will be moved into the body of a cover letter. At the top of the survey, the purpose of the survey will remain.

- b. Discussion** - The Judge present provided feedback on the draft survey. The idea is to get a survey the Judges can complete and that will provide useful information. Commissioner, John Bianconi, asked why mental health/psychological problems are not mentioned. Sue indicated this will have to be added to the survey. All recommended changes were noted.
- b. Timing** – Once a survey has been revised, a conference call will be scheduled with the Judges on the Commission. They will be given three time choices. Two of those should be early morning (8:00am and Noon). A reminder will need to go out the day before the Conference call.

Once this tool is finalized, we will forward it or bring it to the next meeting. Once the survey has been finalized, the Judges will need to decide who will sign off on the letter (we want this to come from the judges). The survey will be sent out electronically, mail or fax by Carl's office. Once the results have been received, they will be compiled. If possible, the survey will be finalized, distributed, have the results compiled and ready for discussion by the next Commission meeting.

5. Behavioral Health Commission Update

Carl provided an update on the Behavioral Health Commission. The workgroups, under the Commission, recently came together to provide an opportunity for everyone to hear what each of the workgroups are doing. Several reports have been provided to the Commission. Included in these reports is an integrated funding analysis. This was drafted by a consulting group (PCG).

Our goal is to try now to cascade down all the issues that have come out of the work groups, the integrated funding report is now out also.

6. Status Action Plan

Regional Clinical Review Process – Sue provided an update on the Regional Clinical Review Process (handout provided). The handout provides information about the target population which include youth either out-of-state or at risk of going out of state. The handout also provides information on the role of the Regional Clinical Coordinators, Role, responsibility, and qualifications of the Individual Reviewers and Regional Clinical Review Teams. Sue thanked Susan Fry and her work group, and Jeanette Rowsey, who put this report together.

Education – Matt Kittle provided an update on a number of items they are working on, including: McKinney/Vento (already mentioned); revising and developing methods of accountability, where institutional schools and policies need to be applied to any residential school; how they can assist schools that are need of financial support; accountability in out of state placements; and establishing and development of standards/expectations for schools and sites that may not be obligated to follow.

7. Service Array in Child Welfare (Community Assessment)

Paul DiLorenzo and John Bumgarner, with the National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement presented information on the Service Array in Child Welfare Community Assessment for the Commission members. The Center for Organizational Improvement supports states that are committed to the welfare of children, youth and families. They offer training, technical assistance, research and evaluation, and it's free.

The Service Array Process (understanding what services are needed and available) is part of the federal requirement, Child and Family Service Review (CFSR). Each state goes through the CFSR every couple of

years. The CFSR is a review of all the work the state is doing, to ensure the quality and scope of services being offered to children and families is appropriate and adequate, and to ensure that the money that the federal government gives to the states is being spent wisely and effectively. This review includes multi-systems and stakeholders.

Because the process requires working collaboratively, they feel WV has an advantage because of the existing collaboratives (Commission and System of Care Implementation Team).

The Service Array Process requires reaching out to people in the community. It includes providers, consumers of service, neighborhood community leaders, state personnel, locals, etc. The process will look at what we currently have is, what we need, and how we provide services. The purpose of the process is to walk away with real services that have been identified as high need, and begin to figure out how to work better with education, mental health, etc. This is also a process that, as you progress, you should see changes in two areas: in changing casework practices and changing systemically.

As already pointed out, there is not a likelihood of more funds coming in, so we need to redesign, redirect, refocus, realign, and try to leverage other funds. The power and strength to do this comes with the collaborative process.

The Commission members had a brief discussion about what would happen in particular situations. Not all cases in WV will be able to respond to the same plans that may have been done in other states. However, it was pointed out that the Service Array Process can be tailored to the particular needs we have here. A suggestion was made to begin with a couple of test districts as pilots to determine how best to proceed here.

Jason commented that he is very pleased with this process and believes it will be beneficial to our needs. It was noted that it is very timely, but he felt it would benefit the Commission in dealing with out of home placement, the new legislation regarding IV-E, and with the re-design of child welfare. We are already set up to work well into this program, as we have child resource networks in every county that feed into the Collaboratives (which are multi-county areas), which feed into our four regional "Summits". Additionally, Jason felt that the System of Care Implementation Team could serve as the State Service Array Steering Committee.

8. Future Commission Model Update

Carl stated that the future of the Commission Model Update will be discussed at the next Commission meeting.

Nest Meeting

The next meeting of the Commission will be **September 6, 2007**.