San Mateo County

Citizen Review Panel

CRP's mission is to assess the child welfare system in the county and make data-driven recommendations for continuous improvement that will help to ensure the safety and well-being of San Mateo County children and their families.

Annual Report & Recommendations
(2014-15 Program Year)
(November-October)

County: San Mateo County

Contact Person for this Report:

Name: Patricia Brown
Phone: 650-823-5952 (c)
Email: brownpcrc@gmail.com

Date Submitted to Office of Child Abuse Prevention: November 20, 2015

Persons at the local County level who received the report:

- Iliana Rodriguez, Director, Human Services Agency
- Dr. Loc Nguyen, Director, Children and Family Services (Child Welfare Services), a division of the Human Services Agency
- Jenell Thompson, Children and Family Services
- John Keene, Chief Probation Officer

1. County Profile (OCAP will provide current data from current annual report)

General Demographics
Ethnic make-up of county
Household income

2. Panel Activities

Panel structure and development

I. Membership (**<u>Workplan Goal #1</u>**)

Have there been any changes in membership or Panel composition during the reporting period?

- Rev. Davidson Bidwell-Waite, Transfiguration Episcopal Church, San Mateo resigned from the Panel. (CRP will be voting on a new clergy representative at the November meeting.)

All prospective members receive the SMCRP Operational Guidelines and they are referred to the CRP website (www.smcrp.org) for more background information. Before they are asked to submit an application for membership, potential Panel members are invited to attend a regular CRP meeting to observe the work of the Panel and meet current members. Visitors sign a Confidentiality Agreement at the beginning of the meeting. Following the visit, if there is continuing interest, the potential member completes an application form and submits it, along with a relevant resume, to the Panel. New members are elected by majority vote of the existing membership.

SMCRP Membership Roster
2014-15

Baumel, Jan	Retired Special Educator, Licensed Educational Psychologist
Chang, Paul	Executive Director, Meridian Human Services
Cherniss, David	Director, Juvenile Mediation Program
DeMarco, Toni	Clinical Services Manager Behavioral Health and Recovery Services, San Mateo County
Karamcheti, Shanthi	Manager, Differential Response and Pre-3 Program, Star Vista
Loewy, Ben	Administrator, San Mateo County Office of Education
Manthorne, Cori	Director of Programs, Community Overcoming Relationship Abuse (CORA)
McCallum, Jamila	Director of Operations, San Mateo Region, Edgewood Center
Miller, Bonnie	Attorney, Private Defender's Office
Monaghan, Ryan	Lieutenant, Field Operations, San Mateo Police Department
Plotnikoff, Bernie	Community Member, Retired Child Abuse Prevention professional
Ragosta, John (Chair)	Program Manager, CASA of San Mateo County
Stewart. Ginny	Licensed Clinical Social Worker
Szyper, Lauren	Program Manager, Daly City Peninsula Partnership Collaborative
Total	13 members

II. Panel Training

Please elaborate on the on-going orientation / training of new CRP members.

Individuals who are interested in joining the Citizen Review Panel are provided with basic information about the role of the Panel in written form and referred to the Panel's website: www.SMCRP.org. The website was updated this year.

CRP's orientation process calls for incoming members of the Panel to talk with the Chair for an orientation session at the beginning of their term. One key responsibility of the CRP facilitator is to ensure an inclusive process in CRP meetings so that all members of the Panel and guests are able to participate comfortably and effectively. This means making sure that acronyms are defined, there are frequent checks for understanding and new members are provided with the opportunity to ask for clarification of any topic under discussion.

Once new members join the Panel, they are encouraged to participate actively and to raise questions as needed. It has been SMCRP's experience that new members add distinct expertise and perspectives to the Panel's conversations. The regular presence of a liaison from Children and Family Services and the Probation Department has been very helpful for ensuring accurate understanding of the complex child welfare system in San Mateo County.

In addition, please describe any training activities the CRP has engaged in this past year as a means of ongoing panel development.

SMCRP members receive information and updates about the child welfare system from the Children and Family Services (CFS) Director and the Juvenile Probation Liaison at each regular meeting. During the course of the year, representatives of various public and private providers in the child welfare system make informational presentations to the Panel at its regular monthly meeting. In addition, Panel members have a regular agenda item, "Panel Member Updates" to encourage individuals to share information with other members about the child welfare-related work they are doing.

Articles and reports are provided to members regularly and, when appropriate, the articles are discussed as part of the meeting agenda.

On a monthly basis, CRP receives and discusses the Children and Family Services Dashboard. This is an internal CFS document that provides a quick overview of data in key interest areas related to children and family services. These monthly reviews of data have provided the Panel with an understanding of the indicators used by CFS to monitor its own programs and services. Panel members are encouraged to direct questions about the Dashboard data to the CFS Director, who attends CRP meetings.

Report on SMCRP WORKPLAN

Workplan Goal #1: Please discuss any activities the Panel has engaged in specific to the recruitment of panel members to reflect community demographics and support creating or maintaining a diverse panel.

On an annual basis, SMCRP reviews its membership and the national criteria for CRP representation. The goal is for CRP members to represent a broad array of backgrounds and perspectives. Currently, CRP members do represent diverse backgrounds and expertise. As needs for specific perspectives are identified, current SMCRP members brainstorm ways to reach out to representatives in those areas. However, since the resignation of Rev. Davidson Bidwell Waite, CRP has been looking for another representative of the clergy perspective. In October, Rev. Kibbie Ruth, who holds the position of Minister for Social Justice at the Congregational Church of San Mateo, visited the regular CRP meeting. She has since confirmed her interest in being appointed to the Panel and her election is on the November meeting agenda.

Parents and youth who have been part of the child welfare system continue to be priority areas, but most other gaps have been filled. Currently, Panel membership stands at 13 members, near the top of the membership range established in the CRP Operational Guidelines.

Last year, SMCRP reviewed and modified its Operational Guidelines to allow the Panel more discretion in situations in which long-term members are interested in continuing their service. This year, because of the relatively high percentage (40% in their first term) of newer members, the Panel exercised its discretion and decided to waive the three-term limit in the case of four long term members.

Workplan Goal #2

Develop a work plan that will guide the panel's review activities of the state and local Child Welfare System.

Each year in its annual report and recommendations, SMCRP identifies areas of focus within the child welfare system. At the same time, the Panel outlines specific activities/evaluation methods to be utilized in order to track progress and evaluate outcomes related to its recommendations for change at both the state and local levels. This information is documented on an annual meeting calendar that guides agenda development throughout the year.

Description of the review activities and any technical assistance provided (example = case review, focus group, data review).

SMCRP meets monthly for two hours during the program year. At each of these meetings informational reports and monitoring activities are on the agenda. These activities include review of written materials and reports, presentations by CWS representatives and sharing of information by CRP members. CFS and Probation have made staff members available to report to the Panel on specific recommendation areas such as Team Decision Making or areas of interest such as child sexual exploitation.

SMCRP has not received technical assistance from sources outside of San Mateo County during the past year.

Findings regarding 2014-15 SMCRP Recommendations
The Panel approved the following findings for inclusion in the 2014-15 annual report:

1. CRP recommends that Children and Family Services (CFS) and other divisions of the child welfare system that are participating in the Katie A. Implementation, (Behavioral Health and Recovery Services -BHRS), assess the effectiveness of the current mental health programs offered to children and families, from the following perspectives:
    - Effectiveness in identifying those in need
    - Effectiveness in delivering services to those in need
    - Effectiveness in assessing the impact (mental health outcomes) of services on re-entry rates and permanence.

    Finding for Recommendation 1:
    Children and Family Services, along with other divisions of the child welfare system participating in Katie A. implementation, has put in place processes and infrastructure to enable data-based evaluation of the effectiveness of mental health programs offered to children and families.

    SMCRP has reviewed one semi-annual report for the period of September 2014-February 2015, submitted to state on April 10, 2015.

2. CRP recommends that CFS assess the effectiveness of efforts to recruit and maintain in-county foster homes, and provide a summary of their current efforts to CRP. The information provided to CRP-should address the following:
    - The current number of homes and duration of service
    - The number of foster children in out-of-county placements, reasons for the placement, and where they were placed.
    - Specific efforts to recruit new foster homes and the results of that recruiting
    - Challenges to recruiting and maintaining foster homes in San Mateo County
    - Services to support foster parents
    - Future plans to address any deficiencies

    Finding for Recommendation 2:
    Through review of monthly CFS Dashboards and reports from CFS staff, CRP finds that efforts to recruit and maintain foster homes in San Mateo County are being implemented. These efforts are going to be supplemented by a new contract with a community-based organization to assist with foster home recruitment using established community networks. CFS is using concurrent planning to identify potential relative caregivers and local San Mateo County foster homes during the period that reunification efforts are underway.

3. CRP recommends that the State of California take steps to ensure the various agencies that make up the child welfare system have adequate training and other resources for meeting mandated expectations. If and when additional resources are not available, the State of California should assist agencies to develop strategies to accomplish the state mandates.

    Finding for Recommendation 3:
    CRP has not received information from the State responding to Recommendation #3

regarding mandated but unfunded or underfunded programs.

Follow up on 2013-14 Recommendations and Areas of Interest

- CRP will monitor efforts by the external evaluator retained by CFS to evaluate the outcomes of the Team Decision Making Program and determine whether this model is the most appropriate model for the various situations in which it is being used.
  Finding: The external evaluation was postponed until 2015-16.

- CRP will monitor the efforts of the external evaluator retained by CFS to evaluate the Family Visitation Program.
  Finding: The external evaluation was postponed until 2015-16.

- CRP will monitor CFS and Juvenile Probation's efforts to work together to ensure that dependents and wards of the Juvenile Court who may be eligible for AB 12 when they turn 18 years, and those youth who are non-minor dependents under AB 12 in both agencies, are receiving equivalent preparation, supports and services. CRP will follow up on the results of current interagency conversations about strategies to accomplish this goal through regular updates.
  Finding: CFS and Juvenile Probation have established a strong partnership and the two entities work together as needed. Inequity of supplemental/discretionary funding between CFS and Juvenile Probation means that AB 12 youth in probation do not have access to the same supports and services as AB 12 youth served by CFS because of budgetary constraints.

- CRP will monitor the implementation of the recently strengthened screening process for contractors and those working directly with children and youth in the Child Welfare System.
  Finding: CFS has reviewed all agencies with contracts. Two agencies could not comply with requirements and their contracts were discontinued.

Areas of interest, for further exploration

1. CRP will discuss approaches to providing positive feedback and validation for child welfare programs and initiatives that are successful.
   Status: CRP is still in the process of exploring approaches to providing validation for child welfare programs and initiatives.

2. CRP will support the efforts of the Domestic Violence Council (DV Council), CORA, and law enforcement organizations with implementing the recommendations of the report recently developed by CORA, as well as help identify any additional recommendations for the DV Council's consideration.
   Status: CRP has received a number of reports from CORA and the San Mateo Police Department about this effort. The recommendations developed through a grant-funded process are in the early stages of implementation.

3. CRP will examine the possibility of assuming an advocacy role in regard to the welfare of children and families in general, and specifically for its own annual report recommendations.
   Status: This topic continues to be an area of interest for SMCRP, but no advocacy efforts have been undertaken during the 2014-15 program year.

4. CRP will continue to gather information about actions being taken in San Mateo County to address the issue of commercially sexually exploited children.
   Status: San Mateo County and the Commission on the Status of Women have indicated strong interest in strengthening and coordinating programs that address this issue.

CRP recommendations for 2015-16
The following are SMCRP's recommendations for 2015-16:

1. CRP recommends that Children and Family Services (CFS) and other divisions of the child welfare system involved in the "Pathways to Wellbeing Program", including Behavioral Health and Recovery Services (BHRS), evaluate the effectiveness of mental health services for children and report to CRP semi-annually on the following:

a) Identification of those in need of service
b) Delivery of services to those identified
c) Timeliness of provision of services
d) Utilization of innovative/promising new therapeutic methods, e.g., Neurosequential Model of Therapeutics

2) CRP recommends that CFS continue its efforts to place children in the child welfare system within San Mateo County in accordance with state-wide requirements of Continuum of Care Reform (CCR) which goes into effect in 2017.

Regular updates to CRP should include the following:

a) Current number of foster homes in San Mateo County in various demographics.
b) Trends in increase or decrease of available foster homes within San Mateo County.
c) Strategies for recruiting homes that can meet the needs of targeted populations.
d) Services provided to support foster families.

In addition to monitoring its two formal recommendations, SMCRP will continue to explore and discuss the following issues of concern:

1) The impact of domestic violence on children and training for first responders on trauma informed care.

2) Disproportionate representation within the child welfare system.

3) Commercially sexually exploited children in San Mateo County, including the work of the County's multi-disciplinary team that is addressing CSEC and the status of two CSEC homes located in San Mateo County.

Discuss how the CRP recommendations will be disseminated to county and state officials as well as the public and how the CRP will handle any comments made.

SMCRP will provide the Director of the San Mateo County Human Services Agency (HSA), the Director of Children and Family Services (CFS) and the Chief Probation Officer with a complete copy of the Annual Report and Recommendations at the time the report is submitted to the State Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP) in November. The report will also be posted on the SMCRP website (www.smcrp.org) and shared with the local Child Abuse Prevention Council, known as the Children's Collaborative Action Team (CCAT). In addition, excerpts from the report will be used in outreach presentations to staff of Child Welfare System agencies, the Foster Parents Association and other groups in San Mateo County. Any comments that result from this process will be presented to SMCRP for consideration.

Future Directions

SMCRP will continue to meet monthly to monitor its recommendations and the delivery of child welfare services in San Mateo County. Time in each meeting will be allocated to reports and presentations relevant to the Panel's stated interests. In addition, there will be an opportunity for new issues/ concerns to be identified and explored. While local funding for child welfare services has improved, SMCRP recognizes the continuing fiscal constraints that child welfare organizations are experiencing. The Panel will continue to look for ways to promote and support productive collaboration that leverages resources to achieve shared goals.

Panel self-evaluation activities (**Workplan Goal #4**)

For many years, SMCRP has conducted an annual self-review, using a locally developed evaluation form. This process takes place in August and September as the annual report is being developed. Panel members review the compiled results of the evaluation and discuss any concerns. The compiled results of this year's self-assessment (and results from prior years) are below:

San Mateo County Citizen Review Panel
Annual Panel Self-Evaluation
August 2015

Compiled results
12 returned evaluations – responses in BOLD

	Scale = 1 (disagree)		to		5 (agree)
1. CRP members take their role seriously and conscientiously prepare for each meeting.	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
				3	**9**
2. CRP members place a high priority on regular meeting attendance.	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
			1	**9**	**2**

	1	2	3	4	5
3. *CRP is working to address priority issues relating to the safety and welfare of children involved with the child welfare system in San Mateo County.*				6	6
4. *CRP members feel informed enough to participate in the discussion of agenda items.*				1 4	7
5. *CRP receives the technical assistance it needs to do its job well.* (11 responses)		1	2	3	5
6. *CRP receives the information it needs from Children and Family Services in an understandable format and in a timely manner.*			3	6	3
7. *CRP receives the facilitation support it needs to do its work in an efficient and inclusive manner.*				1	11
8. *CRP members feel satisfied with the contribution they are making to improving the safety and well-being of children in this community*				8	4

Comments

- I feel some frustration at the responses we receive from CPS. Although we regularly receive the Dashboards and other requested documents, there has been no apparent movement in responding to the concerns of CRP as set forth in our reports over the last two years. Instead we receive comments such as the Department is working on addressing the issue or is obtaining grants and personnel to address the issue. No objective change has been provided.

- CRP membership has seen a tremendous growth this year. The roster is diverse and relevant to the matters at hand. Every member is genuinely interested in the issues and a rigorous discussion usually follows.

  Due to the increase in membership, the need for better time management has arisen with increase in discussion time.

- I would suggest changing the language of the survey to reflect the individual member's feelings and actions rather than what we believe the other members feel or do.

- SMC CRP is fortunate in maintaining a core membership of dedicated and long-standing participation, which greatly aids the work, sharing of system history, and goal

planning within the group. This also supports the orientation and role modeling for newer members.

- I am pleased to see the growth and depth in our membership this past year. Also encouraging is the continued participation of Juvenile Justice. I would like to see more interaction and leadership at the state level for CRPs in California.

- The San Mateo County CRP is strong as it currently stands. It is gratifying to be part of the CRP, even if change we affect is slow to come.

- The San Mateo County CRP should continue to stay focused on our primary goal and be careful of peripheral distractions.

- I feel we have a very diverse and passionate group of individuals whose interests are varied. This often leads to energized conversations, however with the limited time, often issues are not resolved or will add to an agenda that is already full. I think we are beginning to realize this and with more focused meetings be able to tackle the recommendations to our satisfaction.

- Pat Brown continues to provide guidance in a very helpful way. We cannot do without her.

On August 17, 2015, the CRP conducted a verbal assessment of Panel effectiveness.

What is working well	What could be improved
Support by facilitator Reports from CFS and Probation Passion of Panel members The mix of long term and newer members on the Panel	Could have been more focused on our recommendations during the year The recommendations themselves could have been clearer and more measurable More use of “hard data”

4. Public input (Workplan Goal # 4)

SMCRP received very little direct public input during this reporting period. There were a few website queries, but the content was case-specific and the messages were referred to Children and Family Services for follow-up.

The Panel continues to take the following approach to seeking public input after this annual report is developed and published:

- Children’s Collaborative Action Team (CCAT) – members of SMCRP attend CCAT meetings and monitor for new issues of concern identified by this group.

- Provide interested groups within the child welfare system and in the community with presentations about CRP's work.

- Explore use of social media strategies to publicize the work of CRP and the child welfare system in San Mateo County.

5. Attachments

❖ Updated roster of Citizen Review Panel Members, including their affiliations (Attachment A)

❖ San Mateo County Children and Family Services Response to CRP Recommendations 2014-15 (Attachment B)

❖ Notes from SMCRP meetings: July, August, September, October 2015 (Attachment C)

❖ Updated Scope of Work for the Panel activities 2015-2016 (Accompanying Document)

Attachment A

Roster and Terms as of October 2015

The following table reflects the status of current CRP members.

Name	Affiliation	Term
Baumel, Jan	Retired Special Educator, Licensed Educational Psychologist	Fourth term – 9/15-9/18
Chang, Paul	Executive Director, Meridian Human Services	Second term – 9/13-9/16
Cherniss, David	Director, Juvenile Mediation Program	Third term – 9/14-9/17
DeMarco, Toni	Manager, Behavioral Health and Recovery Services, San Mateo County Health System	First term 9/13-9/16
Karamacheti, Shanthi	Manager, Differential Response and Pre-Three Initiative, Star Vista	First term – 4/14-9/17 Resigned 10/15
Loewy, Ben	Administrator, San Mateo County Office of Education	Fourth term – 9/15-9/18
Manthorne, Cori	Director of Programs, Community Overcoming Relationship Abuse (CORA)	First term 9/13-9/16
Miller, Bonnie	Attorney, Private Defenders Office	Third term – 9/13-9/16
Monaghan, Ryan	Lieutenant, Field Operations, San Mateo Police Department	First term 9/13-9/16
Plotnikoff, Bernie	Community member, Retired Child Abuse Prevention professional	Fourth term – 9/15-9/18
McCallum, Jamila	Director of Operations, San Mateo Region, Edgewood Center	Fourth term– 9/15-9/18
Ragosta, John	Administrator, Advocates for Children	Third term – 9/15-9/18
Stewart. Ginny	Licensed Clinical Social Worker	Third Term – 9/14-9/17
Szyper, Lauren	Manager, Differential Response, Daly City Partnership	First term – 6/13-9/16

Children and Family Services Director, Dr. Loc Nguyen, serves as the liaison to SMCRP. He has confirmed that he will continue to participate regularly with CRP for the upcoming year. Christine Villanis, Deputy Chief Probation Officer also attends CRP meetings and provides juvenile probation data and perspective. Patricia Brown facilitates CRP meetings through a contract between CFS and the Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center.

Attachment B

San Mateo County Human Services Agency
CHILDREN & FAMILY SERVICES (CFS)

Response to
Citizens Review Panel (CRP)
Recommendations for 2014-2015

Recommendation #1

CRP recommends that Children and Family Services (CFS) and other divisions of the child welfare system that are participating in the Katie A. Implementation, (Behavioral Health and Recovery Services -BHRS), assess the effectiveness of the current mental health programs offered to children and families, from the following perspectives:

- Effectiveness in identifying those in need
- Effectiveness in delivering services to those in need
- Effectiveness in assessing the impact (mental health outcomes) of services on re-entry rates and permanence.

Katie A Implementation

The Katie A. Settlement Agreement requires counties to partner in a number of ways in order to ensure the screening, referral, assessment and treatment of mental health conditions for youth in the child welfare system. Since February 2013, CFS and Behavioral Health and Recovery Services (BHRS) has been working in collaboration to improve the effectiveness of service provision to children and families involved in child welfare. Both agencies utilize an existing meeting structure and sub-committees to coordinate, collaborate, and improve service integration. For example, the Oversight Committee, with leadership from both agencies, meets monthly to identify service challenges and implement system changes. Recently, the Oversight Committee reviewed and authorized the release of BHRS 101 three-hour training for social workers. The training session covered Katie A specific BHRS policies, procedures and medical necessity criteria as well as specifics on permittable data sharing across systems to expedite mental health services and to provide timely client treatment updates for social workers. A similar session on Children and Family Services' day-to-day service delivery system has been developed and is now being converted into a webinar. This webinar will allow BHRS staff and their partners to take the training on-demand. Other system improvements include BHRS's follow up and utilization of service codes for ICC, and in-home based services (IHBS) within specific teams.

Recommendation #2

CRP recommends that CFS assess the effectiveness of efforts to recruit and maintain in-county foster homes, and provide a summary of their current efforts to CRP. The information provided to CRP-should address the following:

- The current number of homes and duration of service
- The number of foster children in out-of-county placements, reasons for the placement, and where they were placed.
- Specific efforts to recruit new foster homes and the results of that recruiting
- Challenges to recruiting and maintaining foster homes in San Mateo County

Foster Home Recruitment & Support

The County's 2015 System Improvement Plan update (March 2015) included an additional strategy to implement a recruitment and retention plan to increase the number of Resource Families available to meet the specific needs of children and youth in care; especially addressing the number of foster homes available in San Mateo County.

The biggest challenge has been that of the individuals and families who attend our information meetings and become placement homes, 70% are primarily interested in adoption. CFS foster parent recruitment staff continues to focus interested community members on our foster homes for placement philosophy. Resource Parent Training sessions place an emphasis on foster care and that the priority is family reunification.

Additionally, during the past several years, the assigned SW recruiter has been tasked with additional responsibilities that fulfill agency need including on-call back up ER worker and providing support for relative assessments. It has been more than four years since the Agency has had a full-time worker who could dedicate and focus solely on the recruitment process.

The Agency has explored other foster parent recruitment options including the benefits of contracting with a community-based organization. The CBO would be familiar with the geography and demographics of the County and affiliated with other agencies and partners for possible joint recruitment events. We will be looking for a CBO with a network of community groups including faith based organizations and they will need to demonstrate proven outreach strategies and expertise in engaging the community.

As we develop the Request for Proposal we will include data tracking, reporting and evaluation that will assist in the development of recruitment goals and strategies as well as identify any challenge areas. Collected data will include tracking the number of resource family inquiries as well as new resource families by source. In addition, the placement supervisor and workers can provide anecdotal information with regard to the number of and the reasons for out of county placements.

To assist in maintaining placements in our current foster home; CFS has developed a resource family support program that is focused on the children at the Receiving Home. The program identifies the youth while at the Receiving Home and each is matched with a Shelter Care Counselor who establishes rapport with the youth and continues to work with the youth and the foster parents after the child is placed in a foster home. The counselors contact the foster parent and offer placement support including addressing any on-going issues with school, relationships, and substance use/abuse.

Current Foster Home Data

CFS Dashboard Monthly May 2015

Type	**Active Homes**
Foster Care Only	55
Fost-Adopt	48
Sum	103

CFS Dashboard June 2014 – May 2015

Type	**Active Homes**
Foster Care Only	55
Fost-Adopt	48
Sum	103

Safe Measure Time In Placement Setting May 2015
The amount of time a child has been in same out of home placement

Time Open	**Count**	**Percentage**
Under 1 Year	234	67.4%
1 to 2 Years	62	17.9%
2 to 3 Years	19	5.5%
More than 3 Years	32	9.2%
Sum	347	100%

The number of foster children in out-of-county placements, reasons for the placement, and where they were placed.

Out of the 339 children in out-of-home placement as of May 2015, the two primary reasons for removals include general neglect (42.77%) and caretaker

absences/incapacity (38.94%).

As of May 2015, there are a total of 149 or 43.95% of children placed out of county.

One of the main reasons for out-of-county placement is to place the child with relatives or non-extended family member caregiver (NREFM). Placing children with relatives has shown to have an impact on placement stability for children in foster care.

Other reasons for out-of-county placement include; children receiving SILP services, and children placed in FFA Certified homes that can meet the needs of children with intensive care and case management support.

CFS Dashboard Monthly May 2015

Children in Foster Care by Facility Type	**In County Placement**	**Out of County Placement**
Guardian Home	30	0
Group Home	3	17
Foster Family Agency Certified Home	22	56
Relative/NREFM Home	71	33
County Shelter/ Receiving Home	12	0
Foster Family Home	14	2
Supervised Independent Living Placement	37	37
Small Family Home	0	1
Sum	189	146

CFS Dashboard June 2014 – May 2015

Children in Foster Care by Facility Type	**In County Placement**	**Out of County Placement**
Guardian Home	39	1
Group Home	14	67
Foster Family Agency Certified Home	84	148
Relative/NREFM Home	158	62
County Shelter/ Receiving Home	116	0
Foster Family Home	47	5
Court Specified Home	1	3
Supervised Independent Living Placement	71	84
Small Family Home	0	1
Sum	530	371

Recommendation #3	CRP recommends that the State of California take steps to ensure the various agencies that make up the child welfare system have adequate training and other resources for meeting mandated expectations. If and when additional resources are not available, the State of California should assist agencies to develop strategies to accomplish the state mandates.
	CFS will wait to hear if there is a State response to this recommendation.

Attachment C

San Mateo County

Citizen Review Panel

CRP's mission is to assess the child welfare system in the county and make data-driven recommendations for continuous improvement that will help to ensure the safety and well-being of San Mateo County children and their families.

Notes from Meeting
July 20, 2015

Human Services Agency Offices
1 Davis Drive, Montara Room, Belmont CA 94002

Members present: Baumel, Cherniss, DeMarco, Karamcheti, Loewy, McCallum, Miller, Monaghan, Plotnikoff, Stewart, Szyper
Others: Loc Nguyen, Christine Villanis, Pat Brown

Follow-up from last meeting

- Review notes from last meeting – make changes/corrections
  There were a number of corrections to the June notes

- Update on clergy member search: no news on this issue – recruiting efforts are still in progress. Bonnie and Cori are seeking potential members. Christine suggested that if these efforts are not successful, we might want to go back to the Episcopal representatives suggested by Davidson.

Updates from CRP Members

- Toni distributed a flyer for the Neurosequential Model of Therapeutics – the training sessions are open to interested parties, but they must RSVP.

- Lauren reported that Differential Response staff had a Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC) training last month – it dealt with how to use the CSE-it screening tools.

- Ben reported that he had followed up with the Home Within program, a service available to San Mateo County that links qualified counselors with children in foster care. The counselors are committed to staying with the child for the long term, similar to the CASA model. As soon as educational liaisons return from summer vacation, they will be working with Ben on a protocol for how to use this resource. Loc noted that CFS has also contacted Home Within. Toni asked for information about how to connect with the Home Within contact. There was agreement that as this service is launched in SMC, there will need to be some coordination between schools, CFS and BHRS.

CRP Membership Review – member's terms/status

CRP members discussed approaches to dealing with the impact of term limits that would require several long-term, dedicated CRP members to rotate off of the Panel this year. The following issues were raised:

- CRP currently has a good mix of newer and longer-term members due to a vigorous recruiting process two years ago.
- The Panel is functioning effectively with this mix and a loss of the more experienced members could be detrimental.
- Recruiting for community members and other sector representatives has proven very challenging.
- The Panel as currently constituted has representatives from nearly all of the suggested constituencies. The Clergy representative is still being sought.
- The members who would have to leave the Panel are willing and interested in continuing their service.
- There is some uncertainty about continuation of CRP funding past the 2015-16 fiscal year, so this does not seem a good time to make big changes in the Panel's make up.
- David suggested that the Panel has the right, according to the Procedural Rules, to waive the term limit requirement, so if the Panel desires to do this, the current rules do not have to be modified.

David made the motion, seconded by Ginny, that the Panel waive the term limit requirement for this year as it affects the terms of Bernie, Jamila, Ben and Jan.

The Panel unanimously approved this motion.

Review of CFS response to CRP recommendations

San Mateo County Human Services Agency

CHILDREN & FAMILY SERVICES (CFS)

Response to
Citizens Review Panel (CRP)
Recommendations for 2014-2015

Recommendation #1

1. CRP recommends that Children and Family Services (CFS) and other divisions of the child welfare system that are participating in the Katie A. Implementation, (Behavioral Health and Recovery Services -BHRS), assess the effectiveness of the current mental health programs offered to children and families, from the following perspectives:
   - Effectiveness in identifying those in need
   - Effectiveness in delivering services to those in need
   - Effectiveness in assessing the impact (mental health outcomes) of services on re-entry rates and permanence.

Katie A

The Katie A. Settlement Agreement requires counties to partner in a

Implementation

number of ways in order to ensure the screening, referral, assessment and treatment of mental health conditions for youth in the child welfare system. Since February 2013, CFS and Behavioral Health and Recovery Services (BHRS) has been working in collaboration to improve the effectiveness of service provision to children and families involved in child welfare. Both agencies utilize an existing meeting structure and sub-committees to coordinate, collaborate, and improve service integration. For example, the Oversight Committee, with leadership from both agencies, meets monthly to identify service challenges and implement system changes. Recently, the Oversight Committee reviewed and authorized the release of BHRS 101 three-hour training for social workers. The training session covered Katie A specific BHRS policies, procedures and medical necessity criteria as well as specifics on permittable data sharing across systems to expedite mental health services and to provide timely client treatment updates for social workers. A similar session on Children and Family Services' day-to-day service delivery system has been developed and is now being converted into a webinar. This webinar will allow BHRS staff and their partners to take the training on-demand. Other system improvements include BHRS's follow up and utilization of service codes for ICC, and in-home based services (IHBS) within specific teams.

Recommendation #2

CRP recommends that CFS assess the effectiveness of efforts to recruit and maintain in-county foster homes, and provide a summary of their current efforts to CRP. The information provided to CRP-should address the following:

- The current number of homes and duration of service
- The number of foster children in out-of-county placements, reasons for the placement, and where they were placed.
- Specific efforts to recruit new foster homes and the results of that recruiting
- Challenges to recruiting and maintaining foster homes in San Mateo County

Foster Home Recruitment & Support

The County's 2015 System Improvement Plan update (March 2015) included an additional strategy to implement a recruitment and retention plan to increase the number of Resource Families available to meet the specific needs of children and youth in care; especially addressing the number of foster homes available in San Mateo County.

The biggest challenge has been that of the individuals and families who attend our information meetings and become placement homes, 70% are primarily interested in adoption. CFS foster parent recruitment staff continues to focus interested community members on our foster homes for placement philosophy. Resource Parent Training sessions place an emphasis on foster care and that the priority is family reunification.

Additionally, during the past several years, the assigned SW recruiter has been tasked with additional responsibilities that fulfill agency need including on-call back up ER worker and providing support for relative assessments. It has been more than four years since the Agency has had a full-time worker who could dedicate and focus solely on the recruitment process.

The Agency has explored other foster parent recruitment options including the benefits of contracting with a community-based organization. The CBO would be familiar with the geography and demographics of the County and affiliated with other agencies and partners for possible joint recruitment events. We will be looking for a CBO with a network of community groups including faith based organizations and they will need to demonstrate proven outreach strategies and expertise in engaging the community.

As we develop the Request for Proposal we will include data tracking, reporting and evaluation that will assist in the development of recruitment goals and strategies as well as identify any challenge areas. Collected data will include tracking the number of resource family inquiries as well as new resource families by source. In addition, the placement supervisor and workers can provide anecdotal information with regard to the number of and the reasons for out of county placements.

To assist in maintaining placements in our current foster home; CFS has developed a resource family support program that is focused on the children at the Receiving Home. The program identifies the youth while at the Receiving Home and each is matched with a Shelter Care Counselor who establishes rapport with the youth and continues to work with the youth and the foster parents after the child is placed in a foster home. The counselors contact the foster parent and offer placement support including addressing any on-going issues with school, relationships, and substance use/abuse.

Current Foster Home Data

CFS Dashboard Monthly May 2015

Type	Active Homes
Foster Care Only	55
Fost-Adopt	48
Sum	103

CFS Dashboard June 2014 – May 2015

Type	Active Homes
Foster Care Only	55
Fost-Adopt	48
Sum	103

Safe Measure Time In Placement Setting May 2015
(The amount of time a child has been in same out of home placement)

Time Open	Count	Percentage
Under 1 Year	234	67.4%
1 to 2 Years	62	17.9%
2 to 3 Years	19	5.5%
More than 3 Years	32	9.2%
Sum	347	100%

The number of foster children in out-of-county placements, reasons for the placement, and where they were placed.

Out of the 339 children in out-of-home placement as of May 2015, the two primary reasons for removals include general neglect (42.77%) and caretaker absences/incapacity (38.94%).

As of May 2015, there are a total of 149 or 43.95% of children placed out of county.

One of the main reasons for out-of-county placement is to place the child with relatives or non-extended family member caregiver (NREFM). Placing children with relatives has shown to have an impact on placement stability for children in foster care.

Other reasons for out-of-county placement include; children receiving SILP services, and children placed in FFA Certified homes that can meet the needs of children with intensive care and case management support.

CFS Dashboard Monthly May 2015

Children in Foster Care by Facility Type	In County Placement	Out of County Placement
Guardian Home	30	0
Group Home	3	17
Foster Family Agency Certified Home	22	56
Relative/NREFM Home	71	33
County Shelter/ Receiving Home	12	0
Foster Family Home	14	2
Supervised Independent Living Placement	37	37
Small Family Home	0	1
Sum	189	146

CFS Dashboard June 2014 – May 2015

Children in Foster Care by Facility Type	In County Placement	Out of County Placement
Guardian Home	39	1
Group Home	14	67
Foster Family Agency Certified Home	84	148
Relative/NREFM Home	158	62
County Shelter/ Receiving Home	116	0
Foster Family Home	47	5
Court Specified Home	1	3
Supervised Independent Living Placement	71	84
Small Family Home	0	1
Sum	530	371

Loc's: *The CCR legislation is impacting how CFS looks at the need for foster homes. It requires that foster children previously placed in level 1-9 group homes must now be placed into foster homes.*

CFS is also looking at whether foster families are continuing to be available for placements after the completion of their initial placement. This statistic would indicate how satisfying the experience has been.

Recommendation #3

1. CRP recommends that the State of California take steps to ensure the various agencies that make up the child welfare system have adequate training and other resources for meeting mandated expectations. If and when additional resources are not

available, the State of California should assist agencies to develop strategies to accomplish the state mandates.

CFS will wait to hear if there is a State response to this recommendation.

CFS Director's Report – Loc Nguyen

- CFS Update – the number of new cases continues to trend down, while the complexity of the cases is increasing. An example is the three 5150 calls within recent months – children 5-7 years have been in need of these psychiatric holds. This 5150 process was never intended for children and youth, but because of these needs, the County has developed case management protocols for youth and will be adapting these protocols to serve younger children.

  Toni described a 911 brochure that has been developed in consultation with NAMI (National Alliance for Mental Illness) and it addresses how to call for help to avoid unnecessary trauma. Toni will share these brochures with CRP.

Probation Report – Deputy Chief Christine Villanis

This numbers for all months have been revised to exclude those cases that are being investigated but are not formally in the probation system. The total number of cases is trending down, but similar to CFS, cases are becoming increasingly complex.

Monthly Probation Statistics for CRP	Jan-15	Feb-15	Mar-15	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15
Wards On Probation (not including Informal)	450	443	438	438	432	409
Placed Out of the Home	12	12	13	11	15	18
Placed Out of State	0	0	0	0	0	0
Joint Jurisdiction with CFS (241.1)	14	14	14	14	16	15
Probation Lead	4	4	5	6	6	6
Placed Out of State	0	0	0	0	0	0
Child Welfare Lead	10	10	9	8	10	9
AB 12 Non-minor Dependents	3	3	3	3	5	5
Wraparound	7	8	7	7	9	9
Family Preservation Program (FPP)	50	46	43	36	35	36
Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC)	5	3	3	2	3	5

Camp Glenwood - boys (on last day of month)	23	27	27	25	26	14
Camp Kemp - girls (on last day of month)	11	7	11	10	10	11
Juvenile Hall (on last day of month)	97	103	89	77	100	62
Post Disposition	52	59	52	42	60	34
Probation Violation	11	14	13	13	14	7
New Law Violation	34	29	28	20	23	20

Items for next agenda

- Status of member recruiting
- Election of continuing members to new three year terms
- Report from CORA re. implementation of recommendations in DV involving children report
- CRP Self-evaluation Process
- Neurosequential Model of Therapeutics
- Process for development of Annual Report and Recommendations

****

1:00 P Adjourn to Panel's closed session
Approaches to providing positive feedback and validation for child welfare programs

Next meeting
August 17, 2015

San Mateo County

Citizen Review Panel

CRP's mission is to assess the child welfare system in the county and make data-driven recommendations for continuous improvement that will help to ensure the safety and well-being of San Mateo County children and their families.

Notes from Meeting

August 17, 2015

Human Services Agency Offices

1 Davis Drive, Montara Room, Belmont CA 94002

Panel members present: Baumel, Chang, Cherniss, Karamcheti, Loewy, Manthorne, McCallum, Monaghan, Plotnikoff, Ragosta, Szyper
Others: Nguyen, Villanis, Brown

Follow-up from last meeting

- Review notes from last meeting – there were two corrections to the notes.
- Progress on clergy member search – Shanthi has not heard back from her contacts. Cori will be reaching out to Kibbe Ruth who is currently on vacation.

Updates from CRP Members

- Toni – Follow up on article describing Neurosequential Model of Therapeutics – this item was postponed to the September meeting because Toni is on vacation.

CRP Membership Elections:

During the July meeting, CRP agreed to waive the term limitation language in CRP Operational Guidelines and propose re-election to three-year terms for the following members:

- Jan Baumel
- Ben Loewy
- Jamila Pounds
- Bernadette Plotnikoff
-

Chair John Ragosta called for the vote.

On a motion by Paul Chang and a second by Shanthi Karamcheti, Jan, Ben, Jamila and Bernadette were unanimously elected to three-year terms.

John returned the meeting to the facilitator who called for a motion to elect John to a third term on CRP.

On a motion by Jan Baumel and second by Paul Chang, John was unanimously elected to a third three-year term.

Update on TDM program utilization – Q3 2014-15

Jenell Thompson presented information compiled by John Fong. In the period Jan. 1- Mar. 31 2015 (Q3) there were 70 facilitated family or youth meetings. 72% of these meetings were held for Imminent Risk of Placement – whether to leave the child/youth at home (voluntary). The next largest category, at 14%, was Imminent Risk of Placement – whether to leave the child/youth at home (court).
81% of the imminent risk conferences resulted in the child remaining in the home.

There were three Emergency Placement TDMs that resulted in three different outcomes.

CFS has improved its use of TDMs in the sense that there was utilization in all four TDM placement decision points during the reporting period. All three Exit from Placement TDMs resulted in reunification of the child with the parent. There were four Placement Move TDMs with 50% of those youth remaining at the same level of care and 25% maintaining the placement current at the time. Additionally, CFS offered two Facilitated Family Team meetings which provided teaming opportunities for families, but did not necessarily address a placement issue. Finally, 16 foster youth approaching the age of majority were offered a Transitional Conference designed to establish a transition plan within 90 days of their 18th birthday.

Report from CORA re. implementation of recommendations in DV involving children
This item was postponed until September 21 when CORA executive director Melissa Lukin will provide a report at 11:45 am.

CFS Director's Report – Loc Nguyen

- Child Welfare Internal Dashboard
  Loc noted that referrals to CFS continue to trend downward. There were 197 referrals in July 2015.
  CFS has filled 11 social worker positions, but 3 workers have resigned. Recruiting continues. About ½ of social workers who are hired have previous experience.
- CFS is going to reapply for Council of Accreditation certification. This work will complement the ongoing effort at quality assurance.
- SIP goals: CFS has identified goals in visitation, team decision making and foster parents/foster homes. Supervisors perform monthly and quarterly case reviews and regular self assessments that involve teams from outside of the county. SIP is now a five-year process. Jenell offer to provide CRP with a briefing at the September meeting relative to tracking progress toward SIP goals.
- Loc described a new federal review process that will significantly alter the number of case reviews used by CAPTA to assess California's compliance with accountability standards. Counties will have random cases reviewed in the future (2018). SMC is in the size category that will generate 70 cases for review. Some of these reviews will be very intensive (taking up to 30 hours each). From among these county case reviews, 400 will be randomly selected to represent CA's services, along with an administrative review.
- Loc described a process designated "concerted effort" that increases the intensity of case worker involvement during the period of reunification – the number of social worker visits and follow up with services referrals increases to support a successful transition. SMC social workers have already been doing this, but have not called it "concerted effort".
- Bernie asked for specific information related to steps that CFS takes to recruit foster homes. She referred to strategies for outreach that have been used in the past. Loc responded that Continuing Care Reform (CCR), which reduces the use of group home placements, will actually increase the need for foster homes. In 2017, resource families will begin to go through the same process for qualifying to provide foster homes and

adoptive homes. At this time there are separate processes. Sometimes, families volunteer only for adoption opportunities, but as time goes on, some can be encouraged to accept foster placements that may not lead to adoption. He does not have a target number for foster homes needed in SMC.

Deputy Chief Probation Report –Christine Villanis
Christine provided the following information:

Monthly Probation Statistics for CRP	Jan-15	Feb-15	Mar-15	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Jul-15
Wards On Probation (not including Informal)	507	494	495	433	426	420	407
Placed Out of the Home	12	12	13	11	15	18	17
Placed Out of State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Joint Jurisdiction with CFS (241.1)	14	14	14	14	16	15	14
Probation Lead	4	4	5	6	6	6	5
Placed Out of State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Child Welfare Lead	10	10	9	8	10	9	9
AB 12 Non-minor Dependents	3	3	3	3	5	5	5
Wraparound	3	6	7	8	9	10	11
Family Preservation Program (FPP)	50	48	47	36	37	38	40
Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC)	7	6	6	3	5	5	6
Camp Glenwood - boys (on last day of month)	23	27	27	25	26	14	12
Camp Kemp - girls (on last day of month)	11	7	11	10	10	11	9
Juvenile Hall (on last day of month)	97	103	89	77	100	62	70
Post Disposition	52	59	52	42	60	34	53
Probation Violation	11	14	13	13	14	7	8
New Law Violation	34	29	28	20	23	20	9

- Probation supervision numbers are based on Caseload Analysis
- Institutions numbers based on Hall Custody Population Report in JCMS on last day of the month

DRAFT Findings – SMCRP Recommendations 2014-15
Panel members used a worksheet to develop draft findings on the following current and prior

recommendations and areas of interest.

2. CRP recommends that Children and Family Services (CFS) and other divisions of the child welfare system that are participating in the Katie A. Implementation, (Behavioral Health and Recovery Services -BHRS), assess the effectiveness of the current mental health programs offered to children and families, from the following perspectives:
    - Effectiveness in identifying those in need
    - Effectiveness in delivering services to those in need
    - Effectiveness in assessing the impact (mental health outcomes) of services on re-entry rates and permanence.

Finding: Children and Family Services, along with other divisions of the child welfare system participating in Katie A. implementation, has put in place processes and infrastructure to enable data-based evaluation of the effectiveness of mental health programs offered to children and families.

SMCRP has reviewed one semi-annual report for the period of September 2014-February 2015, submitted to state on April 10, 2015.

3. CRP recommends that CFS assess the effectiveness of efforts to recruit and maintain in-county foster homes, and provide a summary of their current efforts to CRP. The information provided to CRP should address the following:
    - The current number of homes and duration of service
    - The number of foster children in out-of-county placements, reasons for the placement, and where they were placed.
    - Specific efforts to recruit new foster homes and the results of that recruiting
    - Challenges to recruiting and maintaining foster homes in San Mateo County
    - Services to support foster parents
    - Future plans to address any deficiencies

Finding: Through review of monthly CFS Dashboards and reports from CFS staff, CRP finds that efforts to recruit and maintain foster homes in San Mateo County are being implemented. These efforts are going to be supplemented by a contract with a community-based organization to assist with foster home recruitment using established community networks. CFS is using concurrent planning to identify potential relative caregivers and local San Mateo County foster homes during the period that reunification efforts are underway.

4. CRP recommends that the State of California take steps to ensure the various agencies that make up the child welfare system have adequate training and other resources for meeting mandated expectations. If and when additional resources are not available, the State of California should assist agencies to develop strategies to accomplish the state mandates.

Finding: CRP has not received information from the State regarding the requirement for programs and services that are not adequately funded.

<u>Follow up on 2013-14 Recommendations and Areas of Interest</u>

1. CRP will monitor efforts by the external evaluator retained by CFS to evaluate the outcomes

of the Team Decision Making Program and determine whether this model is the most appropriate model for the various situations in which it is being used.
Finding: The external evaluation was postponed until 2015-16.

2. CRP will monitor the efforts of the external evaluator retained by CFS to evaluate the Family Visitation Program.
Finding: The external evaluation was postponed until 2015-16.

3. CRP will monitor CFS and Juvenile Probation's efforts to work together to ensure that dependents and wards of the Juvenile Court who may be eligible for AB 12 when they turn 18 years, and those youth who are non-minor dependents under AB 12 in both agencies, are receiving equivalent preparation, supports and services. CRP will follow up on the results of current interagency conversations about strategies to accomplish this goal through regular updates.

   Finding: CFS and Juvenile Probation have established a strong partnership and work together as needed. Inequity of supplemental/discretionary funding between CFS and Juvenile Probation means that AB 12 youth in probation do not have access to the same supports and services as AB 12 youth served by CFS because of budgetary constraints.

Items for next agenda

- Status of member recruiting - Cori
- Briefing on CFS SIP self-review process - Jenell
- Report from CORA re. implementation of recommendations in DV involving children report – Melissa Lukin
- CRP Self-evaluation Process - CRP
- Report on Concurrent Planning process - Jenell
- Neurosequential Model of Therapeutics - Toni
- Process for development of Annual Report and Recommendations - Pat

---

1:00 P Adjourn to Panel's closed session

- Approaches to providing positive feedback and validation for child welfare programs
- Assessment of effectiveness as a Panel - discussion
- Timeline for development of Annual Report

Next meeting
September 21, 2015

San Mateo County

Citizen Review Panel

CRP's mission is to assess the child welfare system in the county and make data-driven recommendations for continuous improvement that will help to ensure the safety and well-being of San Mateo County children and their families.

Notes from Meeting

September 21, 2015

Panel members present: Baumel, Chang, Cherniss, DeMarco, Karamcheti, Loewy, Manthorne, McCallum, Monaghan, Ragosta, Szyper
Others: Nguyen, Villanis, Brown

The meeting started at 11:30 AM with introductions and a welcome to Melissa Lukin, CEO of CORA, who was present to make a presentation.

Follow-up from last meeting

- Review notes from last meeting – there were no corrections to the notes from the August meeting.
- Progress on clergy member search – Cori reported that she has contacted Kibbie Ruth, an ordained minister affiliated with the San Mateo Congregational Church. Pat forwarded information about CRP and Kibbie is interested. She will be attending a meeting in the near future.

Updates from CRP Members

- David announced that the Blue Ribbon Commission has started to meet again. He will provide updates to CRP.
- Shanthi and Lauren told CRP that Differential Response staff members are now using the CSEC screening tool that is being piloted on the west coast.
- Toni provided a brief reminder/update on the Neurosequential Model of Therapeutics approach to intervention. NMT is an online screening tool now in its third year of implementation in SM County. It represents a philosophy on mental health services that rely on understanding of neurological development and the effect of trauma on that development. In our county, there are 30+ trained users of the model and 10 people who have completed "training of trainer" preparation. This year the goal is to train120 additional providers, which makes SM County a training flagship that other counties are watching. Measure A funds have supported this approach to using trauma intervention with activities aimed at teaching self-regulation. Cori noted that CORA is also training its staff members in this model and Christine shared that the approach is being incorporated into the redesign of the Camp Glenwood program. Overall, Toni believes that NMT is contributing to better youth behavior and improved staff morale. She suggested that the approach is applicable across sectors (education, clinicians, etc.).

Report from CORA re. implementation of recommendations in domestic violence incidents involving children

Melissa Lukin, CEO of CORA, presented information about the status of the Coordinated Community Response Project that focused on improving safety for victims of domestic violence and reduces the offender's opportunity to harm victims. The study looked at how documentation of the initial police response to domestic violence calls aids subsequent interveners in domestic violence cases. The following agencies participated in the data collection effort:

- District Attorney's Office
- Sheriff
- Daly City PD
- Redwood City PD
- Probation Department
- Edgewood Center
- Human Services Agency
- CORA
- Keller Center

The study identified the following gaps:

- Gap 1: Little was documented about the exposure to and impact of domestic violence experienced by children at the scenes of domestic violence calls.

- Gap 2: There are missed opportunities for staying connected with victims after they have made their initial call to 911 to report domestic violence.

- Gap 3: The context in which a domestic violence incident occurred is needed by interveners to determine actions to be taken but is sometimes missing from police reports, particularly: (1) the traumatic nature of the event; (2) the history of abuse in the relationship; and (3) what officers saw and heard upon arrival and while on-scene.

- Gap 4: Language and cultural differences sometimes exacerbate victims' embarrassment at or resistance to coming forward, or require the use of interpreters (family members or Language Line) that subsequently create challenges for prosecuting cases.

The next step was to develop some short-term and long-term recommendations to deal with the gaps:

<u>Short term:</u>

Gap #1: Little was documented about the exposure to and impact of domestic violence experienced by children at the scenes of domestic violence calls.

- Develop checklist of important information for officers to document regarding children at the scene; training for officers including the difference between an on-scene assessment and a forensic interview.

Gap #2: There are missed opportunities for staying connected with victims after they have made their initial call to 911 to report domestic violence.

- Include trauma informed responses training in training for responders

Gap #3: Information about the context of the incident is often missing including the traumatic nature of the event, history of abuse, what officers saw or heard upon arrival.

- Incorporate data fields for secondary contact information on forms and in information management systems, and conduct training on it.
- Develop open ended questions more likely to elicit trauma of history

Gap #4: Language and cultural differences can exacerbate victims' resistance to reporting or require the use of interpreters that subsequently create challenges for prosecuting cases.

- Continue the practice of seeking out personnel who speak the languages of those accessing services.

Long-term:

Gap #3: The context in which a domestic violence incident occurred is needed by interveners to determine actions to be taken but is sometimes missing from police reports, particularly: (1) the traumatic nature of the event;
(2) the history of abuse in the relationship; and
(3) what officers saw and heard upon arrival and while on-scene.

- Include risk assessment in upcoming update to the domestic violence incident report
- Departments that don't require written reports for "verbal only's" revisit that policy.
- Create mock pre-trial exercises for officers at the academy or basic training

Next steps:

- Finalize plan to implement short term recommendations including policy changes and trainings
- Client focus groups
- Develop agreement on plan for solicitation of funds to implement longer term recommendations (policies, technology, customized trainings, etc.)
- Share results with DV Council, Chiefs and Sheriff's Association, all city government members and nonprofit partners
- Disseminate project information (press release to local media outlets, postings on social networks and websites and share learning at statewide DV Conference.

Melissa told the Panel that the project partners are in the early stages of implementation. Schools have not yet been involved, which is problematic from educator's perspective since children's behavior in school following a traumatic event could be better addressed with information that the child had been involved in a trauma.

Trauma informed training for law enforcement officers is still being developed. The goal is to get better at identifying children who witness domestic violence as "victims" themselves, so they can receive the support they need.

Briefing on CFS SIP self-review process - Jenell Thompson
This item was postponed to the October CRP meeting.

Report on Concurrent Planning process
Loc addressed this item in his report.

Findings re. 2013-14 Annual Report recommendations

- The Panel approved the following findings for inclusion in the2014-15 annual report:

CRP Recommendations

4. CRP recommends that Children and Family Services (CFS) and other divisions of the child welfare system that are participating in the Katie A. Implementation, (Behavioral Health and Recovery Services -BHRS), assess the effectiveness of the current mental health programs offered to children and families, from the following perspectives:
    - Effectiveness in identifying those in need
    - Effectiveness in delivering services to those in need
    - Effectiveness in assessing the impact (mental health outcomes) of services on re-entry rates and permanence.

    Finding: Children and Family Services, along with other divisions of the child welfare system participating in Katie A. implementation, has put in place processes and infrastructure to enable data-based evaluation of the effectiveness of mental health programs offered to children and families.

    SMCRP has reviewed one semi-annual report for the period of September 2014-February 2015, submitted to state on April 10, 2015.

5. CRP recommends that CFS assess the effectiveness of efforts to recruit and maintain in-county foster homes, and provide a summary of their current efforts to CRP. The information provided to CRP-should address the following:
    - The current number of homes and duration of service
    - The number of foster children in out-of-county placements, reasons for the placement, and where they were placed.
    - Specific efforts to recruit new foster homes and the results of that recruiting
    - Challenges to recruiting and maintaining foster homes in San Mateo County
    - Services to support foster parents
    - Future plans to address any deficiencies

    Finding: Through review of monthly CFS Dashboards and reports from CFS staff, CRP finds that efforts to recruit and maintain foster homes in San Mateo County are being implemented. These efforts are going to be supplemented by a contract with a community-based organization to assist with foster home recruitment using established community networks. CFS is using concurrent planning to identify potential relative caregivers and local San Mateo County foster homes during the period that reunification efforts are underway.

6. CRP recommends that the State of California take steps to ensure the various agencies that make up the child welfare system have adequate training and other resources for meeting mandated expectations. If and when additional resources are not available, the State of California should assist agencies to develop strategies to accomplish the state mandates.

    Finding: CRP has not received information from the State responding to Recommendation #3 regarding mandated but unfunded or underfunded programs.

Follow up on 2013-14 Recommendations and Areas of Interest

- CRP will monitor efforts by the external evaluator retained by CFS to evaluate the outcomes of the Team Decision Making Program and determine whether this model is the most appropriate model for the various situations in which it is being used.
  Finding: The external evaluation was postponed until 2015-16.

- CRP will monitor the efforts of the external evaluator retained by CFS to evaluate the Family Visitation Program.
  Finding: The external evaluation was postponed until 2015-16.

- CRP will monitor CFS and Juvenile Probation's efforts to work together to ensure that dependents and wards of the Juvenile Court who may be eligible for AB 12 when they turn 18 years, and those youth who are non-minor dependents under AB 12 in both agencies, are receiving equivalent preparation, supports and services. CRP will follow up on the results of current interagency conversations about strategies to accomplish this goal through regular updates.
  Finding: CFS and Juvenile Probation have established a strong partnership and the two entities work together as needed. Inequity of supplemental/discretionary funding between CFS and Juvenile Probation means that AB 12 youth in probation do not have access to the same supports and services as AB 12 youth served by CFS because of budgetary constraints.

The Panel then developed its finding for the following follow up issue:

- CRP will monitor the implementation of the recently strengthened screening process for contractors and those working directly with children and youth in the Child Welfare System.
  Finding: CFS has reviewed all agencies with contracts. Two agencies could not comply with requirements and their contracts were discontinued.

Probation Report – Deputy Chief Christine Villanis

Monthly Probation Statistics for CRP	Jan-15	Feb-15	Mar-15	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Jul-15	Aug-15
Wards On Probation (not including Informal)	507	494	495	433	426	420	407	411
Placed Out of the Home	12	12	13	11	15	18	17	18
Placed Out of State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Joint Jurisdiction with CFS (241.1)	14	14	14	14	16	15	14	15
Probation Lead	4	4	5	6	6	6	5	6
Placed Out of State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Child Welfare Lead	10	10	9	8	10	9	9	9
AB 12 Non-minor Dependents	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5

Wraparound	3	6	7	8	9	10	11	9
Family Preservation Program (FPP)	50	48	47	36	37	38	40	37
Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC)	7	6	6	3	5	5	6	6
Camp Glenwood - boys (on last day of month)	23	27	27	25	26	14	12	11
Camp Kemp - girls (on last day of month)	11	7	11	10	10	11	9	11
Juvenile Hall (on last day of month)	97	103	89	77	100	62	70	78
Post Disposition	52	59	52	42	60	34	53	41
Probation Violation	11	14	13	13	14	7	8	11
New Law Violation	34	29	28	20	23	20	9	26

- Probation supervision numbers are based on Caseload Analysis
- Institutions numbers based on Hall Custody Population Report in JCMS on last day of the month

CFS Director's Report – Loc Nguyen

- Child Welfare Internal Dashboard – there were no questions re. the dashboards. Loc noted that the numbers of referrals are still dropping. San Mateo County has one of the lowest referral rates in the state.
- Concurrent planning – Loc told the Panel that in 1997 the Federal government determined that placement in foster care should not be permanent. To address the goal of finding a permanent placement for a child should the goal of reunification with the family not be attainable, the concept of "concurrent planning" was developed. In concurrent planning, two parallel tracks are implemented. One social worker works with the family to set and help them achieve goals leading to reunification, while a second social work is assigned to work on a "back-up plan" if reunification cannot be achieved. This alternative plan may be adoption by relatives, adoption by non-related extended family member on adoption by a qualified adult not related/previously known to the family.
  When a child is removed from the family, this concurrent process is initiated.
- Strategic Planning by the Human Services Agency – Loc distributed copies of the HSA strategic plan, developed over the past year. It is a five year plan with the following strategic goals:
  1. Customers - achieve and sustain a healthy, safe and productive life.
  2. Workforce – enhance employee skills to support excellence.
  3. Operations – enhance internal infrastructure to optimize outcomes,
  4. Innovation – harness creativity and interconnectedness as a leading Human services agency.
  5. Collaboration – cultivate community partnerships to achieve shared goals.

Items for next meeting agenda

- Develop recommendations for 2015-16
- Report on SIP self-review process – Jenell Thompson

Adjourn to Panel's closed session

- Approaches to providing positive feedback and validation for child welfare programs

San Mateo County

Citizen Review Panel

CRP's mission is to assess the child welfare system in the county and make data-driven recommendations for continuous improvement that will help to ensure the safety and well-being of San Mateo County children and their families.

Notes from Meeting
October 19, 2015
Human Services Agency Offices
1 Davis Drive, Montara Room, Belmont CA 94002

Panel members present: Baumel, Chang, Cherniss, DeMarco, Karamcheti, Loewy, Manthorne, McCallum, Monaghan, Plotnikoff, Ragosta, Stewart, Szyper
Others: Loc Nguyen, Christine Villanis, Kibbie Ruth, Pat Brown

Follow-up from last meeting

- Review notes from last meeting – there were several grammatical corrections.
- Progress on clergy member search – Kibbie Ruth attended the meeting as a potential candidate for Panel membership.
- Briefing on CFS SIP self-review process - Jenell Thompson
  Jenell provided a brief overview of the SIP (System Improvement Process) being implemented by CFS. There are now seven statewide data indicators: two measuring children's safety and protection from maltreatment and five measuring the permanence and stability of children's living arrangements. The overall term for SIP has increased from 3 to 5 years. Each year there are quarterly updates to the state and an annual report.
  In response to a question from the Panel, the use of the entry cohort rather than the exit cohort for evaluation purposes was explained.

  Jenell will return in April 2016 to provide SMCRP with the 2015 annual report.

Updates from CRP Members
Shanthi: Announced she has resigned from her position at StarVista and this will be her last CRP meeting. She noted that she has enjoyed her service on the Panel.

Cori: October is Domestic Violence Awareness month. There will be a number of events, including the presentation of the Hammerman Award and a presentation to the Board of Supervisors on Oct. 22. CORA's annual luncheon will be held on October 29th.

Election of CRP Chair and Vice Chair for 2016
From Operating Guidelines for CRP:
CRP will elect a chair and a vice chair by a majority vote at the regular meeting in September each year. At CRP's discretion, co-chairs may be selected to fulfill the role of chair and vice chair. Co-chairs will share equally the responsibilities of the chair.

- The one-year term of office for the chair and vice chair will run from October through September of the following year.
- The chair will work with the CRP facilitator to ensure effective meetings and will represent the Panel when appropriate. The chair and the facilitator will clarify their respective roles and responsibilities for the benefit of the Panel.
- The chair may not serve more than two consecutive terms.

In accordance with CRP's Operational Guidelines, current chair, John Ragosta has served two consecutive terms and is not eligible for re-election.

After some discussion, Ben Loewy agreed to stand for election as chair and Paul Chang volunteered to be co-chair.

On a motion by Jan Baumel, seconded by Bernadette Plotnikoff, the slate of Ben Loewy for Chair and Paul Chang for co-chair was unanimously approved for one year.

Probation Report – Deputy Chief Christine Villanis
Case numbers have been creeping up and camp planning is underway. The department is looking at other camp programs and how they handle home passes.

Monthly Probation Statistics for CRP	Jan-15	Feb-15	Mar-15	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Jul-15	Aug-15	
Wards On Probation (not including Informal)	507	494	495	433	426	420	407	412	422
Placed Out of the Home	12	12	13	11	15	18	17	18	17
Placed Out of State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Joint Jurisdiction with CFS (241.1)	14	14	14	14	16	15	14	15	17
Probation Lead	4	4	5	6	6	6	5	6	6
Placed Out of State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Child Welfare Lead	10	10	9	8	10	9	9	9	11
AB 12 Non-minor Dependents	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5
Wraparound	3	6	7	8	9	10	11	9	12
Family Preservation Program (FPP)	50	48	47	36	37	38	40	37	31
Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC)	7	6	6	3	5	5	6	6	8

Camp Glenwood - boys (on last day of month)	23	27	27	25	26	14	12	11	10
Camp Kemp - girls (on last day of month)	11	7	11	10	10	11	9	11	13
Juvenile Hall (on last day of month)	97	103	89	77	100	62	70	78	76
Post Disposition	52	59	52	42	60	34	53	41	50
Probation Violation	11	14	13	13	14	7	8	11	18
New Law Violation	34	29	28	20	23	20	9	26	8

Probation supervision numbers are based on
Caseload Analysis
Institutions numbers based on Hall Custody Population Report in JCMS
on last day of the month

Chris announced that her assignment has been changed and she will be taking on the role of Director of the Institutions Division. Roy Brazil will be replacing her. She has mentioned her service with CRP, but suggests that the Panel contact him directly to invite his participation.

CFS Director's Report – Loc Nguyen
Loc noted that in September there was a spike in referrals. When asked if that related to school starting, he told CRP that schools are actually only the 4th in providers of referrals – the other sources are therapists, other professionals and law enforcement.

He reported that the Continuum of Care (CoC) legislation has been signed and will go into effect in 2017. This legislation calls for the elimination of group homes for placement and changes in the resource family approval process. There will have to be a lot of work with families and other caregivers to enable them to provide the level of care provided by group homes.

Children and Family Services will be pursuing a renewal of its accreditation in the upcoming year.

Development of CRP Recommendation(s) for Annual Report 2014-15
Panel members used the remainder of the meeting to identify and discuss potential areas for recommendations to include in the annual report. The following issue areas were discussed:

- Commercially sexually exploited children (CSEC)
- Neurosequential Model of Therapeutics (NMT) and its use in SMC
- Disproportionate representation in the child welfare system
- Domestic violence and trauma informed care

In addition, the Panel discussed continued focus on Recommendations 1 and 2 that have been monitored during the current year.

2013-14 recommendations

7. CRP recommends that Children and Family Services (CFS) and other divisions of the child welfare system that are participating in the Katie A. Implementation, (Behavioral

Health and Recovery Services -BHRS), assess the effectiveness of the current mental health programs offered to children and families, from the following perspectives:

- Effectiveness in identifying those in need
- Effectiveness in delivering services to those in need
- Effectiveness in assessing the impact (mental health outcomes) of services on re-entry rates and permanence.

8. CRP recommends that CFS assess the effectiveness of efforts to recruit and maintain in-county foster homes, and provide a summary of their current efforts to CRP. The information provided to CRP-should address the following:
    - The current number of homes and duration of service
    - The number of foster children in out-of-county placements, reasons for the placement, and where they were placed.
    - Specific efforts to recruit new foster homes and the results of that recruiting
    - Challenges to recruiting and maintaining foster homes in San Mateo County
    - Services to support foster parents
    - Future plans to address any deficiencies

Since there was insufficient time to complete the discussion, Paul Chang offered to draft modified versions of the 2013-14 recommendations for review by the Panel between now and the November CRP meeting.
There was strong agreement among Panel members that the recommendations for the upcoming year should be limited in number, clearly aligned with CRP's mission and specific enough to enable progress to be monitored.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 PM.

Next meeting November 16, 2015