

## State Advisory Council Minutes

Monday, October 6, 2014

### Members in attendance

Claudia Carbonari, M.D., Elisabeth Cannata, Deb Kelleher, Patricia Lorenson, Regina Moller

### Also in Attendance:

Irma Camacho, Susan Smith, Dan Lyga

### Members Absent

Janice Andersen (excused), Jacquelyn Farrell, Donna Grant, Regina Roundtree, Susan Sherrick

### Welcome & Introductions

Patricia Lorenson

Deb Kelleher has been appointed to represent RAC Region 5 (replacing Kelly Cronin).

### SAC Membership-Current List, Appointment Process (packet attached to minutes)

-The reappointments of Janice Andersen (3<sup>rd</sup> term) and Dr. Claudia Carbonari (2<sup>nd</sup> term) were received, both through 6/30/15.

Regina Moller has been appointed to her 1<sup>st</sup> term to serve in the Person Interested in the Delivery of Service category through 6/30/16.

Dr. Erica Kesselman's application for a SAC appointment is going through the review process. We expect a decision in the next couple of weeks.

-A work group was formed to focus on SAC membership and vacancies to be filled. The group will reach out to the RAC leadership to fill the parent/family member and youth categories. Regional Administrators will also be contacted.

The work group consists of Pat Lorenson, Irma Camacho, Regina Moller, and Deb Kelleher. A call out to RAC chair/member, and Regional Administrators will also be made. Regina Moller will be the point person for this group and will facilitate a conference call meeting.

-It was noted that Region 5 has a great number of youth who participate on RAC but many are unable to make a commitment to a Monday morning meeting. The same holds true for the parent/family member's category. Region 6 modified their RAC meeting schedule to meet 5pm – 6:30pm by family request.

-Considerations regarding the change of day and time of the SAC meeting and locations was discussed. Maria Obregon will explore available sites for evening meetings.

-Clarification about the amount of CRP funds that will be available is pending. If the council moves to hold evening meetings it will be necessary to cover the cost of a light dinner for attendees.

-Expediting the process of SAC candidate's approval was discussed. A suggestion to transfer appointment authority to the DCF Commissioner was noted. This would require a SAC nominating/membership committee to do the vetting piece to submit for Commissioner.

-Susan Smith noted that what was being proposed required a legislative change. Since we are approaching the time of developing the DCF legislative agenda-SAC needs to determine if this is the path to pursue and if we have the resources to do it.

The workgroup will begin to tackle the SAC appointment process and filling the current SAC vacancies. The group will return with recommendations of both names and how to proceed.

-Discussions were carried out about the days of the week that would be feasible to hold SAC evening meetings. The consensus was that Tuesday would be the better late afternoon or early evening when polling those in attendance to make the change.

-Discussions regarding the lack of pediatricians and educators on SAC followed. It was noted that if the language is not explicit, then SAC has the flexibility to interpret it. These could fall under the category of child care professional, although Pat Lorenson that noted that by definition "educator" could not, and gave a brief history.

Susan will ask DCF attorney to look at the definitions in the statutes. This is also an opportunity to see if the language is too restrictive or it is general.

-The use of technology for SAC meetings will also be considered by this work group.

Ms. Smith noted that conferencing from a regional office and central office would make conferencing easier as each office is equipped with the same conferencing units. The use of outside devices, such as iPads, iPhones etc. will require additional investigation as to the number of nodes available for devices that need to log in at a specific certain time.

Phone conference is unlimited, particularly from the area offices that are also equipped with phone conferencing equipment.

## **DCF Updates**

Susan Smith

-**DCF Development Overview** of federal funding report was reviewed and attached to the minutes. This outlines some of the grants the department received over the past calendar year. DCF garnered \$9 million in federal grants. (Elizabeth Duryea is our Director of Development and would be happy to report in more detail.)

-Elm City Project Launch (ECPL)-supports care for 0-8 children, prevention and early identification with respect to behavioral care needs and addresses their physical, social, emotional behavioral health development. It is targeted to Region 2, City of New Haven. We will receive \$4million over the next five years.

-We were awarded phase 2 of the CONNECT Congregate Care Reduction & Diversion grant for \$4 million over four years. It allows us to develop that integrated network of care and create some of the infra-structure related to that. Tim Marshall is the lead.

-the Connecticut HART Project just received \$1million over the next five years for our work relating to our domestic minor sex trafficking. We will engage in a needs assessment, identify some of the service gaps for the population of children and youth who may have been part of that or at risk of being part of the human sex trafficking in developing greater collaborations of partnership across state agencies. Tammy Sneed is the lead on this project.

-DCF Social Impact Bond (SIB) - is not a grant per se but an initiative we are doing in partnership with Harvard University. It is an innovative kind of funding strategy and mechanism. There are some jurisdictions who have engaged in this and working with Professor Jeffrey Liebman, eminent economist who came up with this model of funding through an investment type of strategy. Procurement occurred to get a fiscal fiduciary to support some of the development work with respect to the funding for this. Our focus with the SIB is on substance abuse intervention and covers supports for DCF families and adolescents. We meet monthly to figure out what the population and our focus will be. Don't know what the actual dollar amounts will be because will be raising capital. It is a very different kind of funding structure and model that we think about in terms of state government. It is an interesting and promising project that Elizabeth Duryea is open to come and talk more expansively about.

### Partnerships with Other Agencies

DCF has been asked to partner with the following projects:

-CMS Clifford Beers –Wraparound New Haven

-Now is the Time-DMHAS applied for the transition of young adults (DCF over to DMHAS?)

-Early Head Start in most regions and the Office of Early Childhood is taking the lead

-MIECHV is an off-shoot of Nurturing Families Network the funders were between DSS and DPH.

-2014 Performance Expectations (attached to the minutes)

This is a slide of the 2014 Performance Expectation that Commissioner had identified for the department. These should be familiar to the provider folks as they were presented at the Statewide Provider meeting held in January and a subsequent meeting in July.

These are some of the predicates of the discussion. These ten expectations have been focusing the work of the department in the course of the year. We are looking to refine them as well as adopting some additional ones for 2015 which are giving resonance to the strategic plan. The strategic plan is under the association of the performance expectations.

-We are moving forward to exit from the Consent Decree and working in ways to achieve those positive outcome measures.

-Commissioner has been focusing on increasing kinship placement and asking staff to look at that as being a primary resource for kids. You may be familiar with the considered removal teaming- another practice that is in place that when we are looking a potentially bringing a child into care that we will have a meeting with that family and others to figure out a safety plan that we can initiate to keep that child in the home with those parents/caregivers or other family members that we can put the child with and continue the search so kids are placed with kin where possible and hopefully initially so we are not transitioning a child from one foster setting to a family setting.

Comment from member:-At a recent RAC Region 2 meeting a number of parents recommended to have available a brochure that explains the purpose and philosophy of the department in holding these meetings because it is not always explained clearly by the worker. Sue Smith will look into this.

-Reduction of congregate care-

-Thinking about a more targeted foster care recruitment, particularly for adolescents

-Reducing our APPLA goals

-Reducing our children in placement numbers

-Real focus on racial and ethnic disparities and some of this proportionality work we have been doing with Racial Justice work.

-Developing comprehensive and integrated regional networks of care.

Improving the quality and satisfaction of foster homes and

-Sound fiscal management

-Clarification requested of the term “in-care” stated in the performance expectations. Ms. Smith explained that it means “kids coming out of their home and being placed with the department.” We need to be focusing more on community-based care. The Commissioner wants that 90% of service to kids happening in the community and 10% is happening in the congregate setting. So this term does not mean denying people care but it is how and where care is delivered. These are the kids who are in placement. “In care” to us is means kids who are in placement to us.

### **RAC & Community Update**

Region 1- Janet Ortiz with Nehemiah Commission reported about an issue that arose as a result of the department’s recent change regarding the transportation of the children that they serve. It has affected the number of children to be brought from 25 to 6. These are the high end behavioral issue children who customarily get bumped out of all after school programs. They will be unable to meet at Nehemiah. The college students who provided transportation to these children are unable to meet the certification/insurance requirements imposed by the new rule. This after school program is needed desperately and they are asking for help and support from the community.

Ms. Smith noted that the credentialing for transportation needed corrections. There were some instances where some transportation was happening in ways that were not safe or appropriate. The intention is to know who is transporting kids, the cars are safe, proper vehicles are being used and that people are properly insured and other liability protection is in place for everybody. She is not aware of the particulars at this time.

-It was noted that in handling these kinds of specific things that come up – we need to have a process to handle it with an ending time to report back.

-More information is needed to address this.

-It was recommended that adding ISSUES TO FOLLOW to the SAC agenda would help to track the follow up. This would also address how SAC and RAC are working together.

Region 3- no report, still working on sub-committee reports.

Region 6- with regard to the questions posed about how RACs advise the SACs and vice versa, Region 6 is finally up and running and pursuing some work groups. This RAC chose to be strategically slow in building up the participation and intent. They have now pin pointed the areas that the RAC be advising DCF and helping DCF in the region. It needs to tie in with the goals of DCF. Two major items of focus are: strategies to improve recruitment for foster families for teens and around resources and reputation. There are three work groups, Recruitment foster families for Teens, Reputation of DCF in the region, and how RAC can advise them, and the third, Resources. If the performance expectations were to change as of January-mindful to keep track of that. Lots of energy being demonstrated at the meetings as workgroups break out during the meeting to generate specific recommendations in time for the May report that is tied into the CRP funds.

### **SAC/CRP RFPs**

Patricia Lorenson

CRP- it is understood we have money. No one at DCF has authorized or approved any change. Budget issues- the last known, all six regions have received their funds. Because the retreat went over budget, Region 4 received almost \$200 less because they applied after the deadline

- Region 6 reported they have not received the CRP funds. (Elizabeth Cannata's group is the fiduciary for Region 6 & 4 and is not aware of the receipt).
- In response to the question, the start date of the CRP funds is September 1, 2014.
- Region 1- Irma Camacho noted that the CRP check that is received from FAVOR does not identify that it is CRP money.

### **September Retreat**

Patricia Lorenson

-Pat Lorenson expressed her gratitude to Dr. Carbonari for all her efforts in putting together the first panel for the retreat. Dr. Carbonari intended that each panel member would give a different perspective. The only drawback was the time crunch and more time needed for discussions, questions and answers. She was satisfied that each panelist felt they accomplished what they set out to do.

- For the 2015 retreat, a group of people will work on the retreat at least eight months ahead of time.
- Noted that the ER perspective from the panel was very enlightening, understanding their process, frustrations, and handicaps even if they expand a new unit.
- Going forward- it was recommended that a foster parent report be current as some of the examples brought up at the retreat were things that were already resolved in the DCF system.

### **SAC's Future Planning**

-the *Legislative Responsibilities Outlined for the SAC* report from Patricia Lorenson was reviewed. Pat asked that everyone look at the report she put together and what statutes spell out as SAC's role. This will be a discussion topic at the next meeting.

- This document addresses the question posed at the retreat as to what DCF wants from the SAC/RAC.
- Overall it was noted all the requirements are not being followed by SAC nor DCF.
- Strategic Plan is coming to its end in 2014, SAC assistance in the development of the update of the Strategic Plan is expected.
- Noted was that the expectations as a CRP are not included in this report.
- Members asked that the legal department and legislative unit- review this document
- Susan Smith addressed some of the questions posed. She noted that this is a question of the organization of it. If you consider your link with the RAC as a feeder, then that becomes the mechanism for info to be formally made public to the SAC. It has only been during this year that RAC updates are a standing agenda item. It is through that partnership that it comes out through the SAC.
- SAC itself does all of it but it is through that partnership it comes out through the SAC. That was part of the discussions we started to have then a lot of the time has shifted towards membership. We were also starting to address how we operationalize the CRP expectations. How do we maximize the participation through the RACs?
- Also noted was that we don't have CBHAC as a standing update. There is history where SAC removed themselves from being the appointing authority from CBHAC a few years ago.

- Noted was that some of the requirements are unrealistic, i.e. as section 17A-9-(a) Appointments....  
*"That the commissioner shall appoint, after consultation with the state advisory council, and may remove in like manner....." Or submitting the budget to SAC for comment.*
- Ms. Smith continued that it is about how it is being done....if you asses the continuum of care and you recognize there may potentially be gaps, do we need a budget option to cover that gap. We need to be thoughtful about how we incorporate these in the conversations we are generally having.
- That was the intent with the CRP duties. How do we use our notes and minutes to develop the report from discussions we are having generally?  
 So if we are clear about our areas of priority-then we can better determine what is needed in terms of resource, oversight, and data. We have not yet coalesced on what our focus is. We need to identify our focus and priority for the course of the year. (Are there certain aspects of the service system or certain concepts that we want to focus our time?)
- When you look at the results from the RACs at the retreat- they are looking at SAC to be the connection for the information and material.  
 Need to come up with major themes. Need to formalize what the themes were that came out of the retreat, what the RACs wanted and get a melding of the retreat results and look at what the department's framework is.
- The *Final Statements per Region* from the retreat was reviewed. The RACs are looking to SAC to be the connection for information and material.
- By next meeting, all RACs must submit a concise summary from each region with basic concepts. Need to formalize what the themes were that came out of the retreat, what the RACs wanted and get a melding of the retreat results and look at what the department's framework is.  
 Any input from the RAC chairs in consolidating what you think your RAC wants or looking broadly at all of them.
- Please email directly to Pat Lorenson. It will then be put together, and sent back to the RACs and proceed from there. This process would address the sense of disconnect with SAC that RACs expressed.
- In keeping with the theme of communication of SAC to RAC, clarification of the core of today's meeting was discussed.
- The membership issues
- Looking at the retreat- retreat planning committee will be formed in the near future
- Review the retreat results
- Statutory requirements for SAC
- For next month the co-chair will work framework and concise the Final Statements.
- SAC structure needs to be finalized.
- Refine standing agenda items.

### **November Meeting Planning**

- The presentation from the Project Development Director, Elizabeth Duryea will be postponed.
- Discussion among members and the need to move forward on the overall agenda resulted in the reinstatement of the December 1, 2014 SAC meeting to be held. Notifications will be sent to SAC members.
- It was requested that RSVP be obtained for the SAC meetings.
- It was noted that because SAC is a public meeting, RAC members are welcome to the meetings. It is also possible for persons interested in SAC membership or awaiting appointment to attend these meetings.

### **2014-2015 Meeting schedule**

- Moving SAC meetings to Tuesday late afternoon or early evening or keeping it for the Monday mornings. The poll will be conducted.

-Ms. Lorenson noted that a gift list for Solnit South was posted on the DCF web. She asked that this be brought to the RACs.

Meeting ended at 11:40 a.m.