

State Advisory Council Minutes

Monday, March 7, 2015

Members in attendance: Elisabeth Cannata, Samantha Forbes, Deb Kelleher, Stephanie Lizotte, Sarah Lockery, Regina Moller, Sue Sherrick,

Also in Attendance: Irma Camacho RAC Region 1, Myke Halpin RAC Region 3, Precious Price co-chair RAC Region 5, Dave Santis, Fernando Muñiz, Susan Smith

Members Absent: Erica Kesselman, M.D., Alana Parkinson

Welcome & Introductions

Regina Moller

Meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m.

Deb Kelleher introduced Precious Price, co-chair of Region 3 RAC. She is a former foster youth and has become very active with the Region 3 RAC. She was awarded an internship in Washington D.C. by the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute as one of twelve awardees. She will be working in Congress for three months.

Elisabeth Cannata invited Ms. Price to return to SAC after her assignment to share what she learned and what we need to know as a system.

All in attendance introduced themselves.

Membership: The *SAC Membership list, as of January 2016* (Attachment 1) and the *RAC Chairs 2016* list (Attachment 2) were reviewed for accuracy. Ms. Moller addressed the ending of her first term in June 2016 and whether she was required to re-fill the Background Information Questionnaire for the Governor's office. Maria will verify the requirement with the Governor's office and send the information to SAC.

Current vacancies were reviewed. Regina Moller stated that one of the issues of filling the Parent/family member categories was the requirement of completing the cumbersome Background Information Questionnaire. SAC had discussed a possible solution to fill this category was to increase the RAC appointments to two persons from each RAC, with one identified as the Parent/Family Member category.

Susan clarified that any category that is a *Governor appointment* must have legislative change.

This proposed change will need to be postponed another year and addressed in the next legislative session.

Ms. Moller stated that in the meantime each of the RACs should bring a family member to the meeting in order that their voice be taken into consideration when voting on issues.

There are stipends available for family members to offset gas, child care expenses if they have to travel on their own. The amount is \$25 stipend.

The vacancy of a psychiatrist was noted. Deb Kelleher had contacted Dr. Robert Sahl from the Institute of Living. Dr. Carbonari was going to contact him as he wanted to know from her point of view, what his commitment was as a child psychiatrist and what the time constraints would be. Ms. Kelleher will write Dr. Sahl and introduce the SAC co-chairs to continue discussions if he is still willing to consider membership on SAC.

Regarding the youth appointments, is there someone in the Youth Advisory Board who would be willing to serve on SAC as a governor youth appointee. Susan will follow up on this.

The requirement for the attorney category was reviewed and discussions followed about possible sources to contact. Addressing the question of membership and income, Susan read the following from the current SAC Statute as amended by Public Act 12-82, § 2 (Effective October 1, 2012).

On and after October 1, 2014, no more than half the members of the council shall be persons who receive income from a private practice or any public or private agency that delivers mental health, substance abuse, child abuse prevention and treatment, child welfare services or juvenile services.

Regina Moller moved that SAC establish a \$25 Stop & Shop gift card for family members that attend SAC. Whatever is left from year will be carried over to the next. Deb Kelleher seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

CJTS Update

Fernando Muñiz, Deputy Commissioner for Administration at DCF.

Presented an update and asked for SAC input regarding the closure of CT Juvenile Training School.

The Governor has called for the closure of CJTS by July 1, 2018. We have seen a steady decrease of the population at CJTS so the timing is right for us to re-evaluate using the training school in the continuum.

The department is taking a three part approach.

First, gathering as much input from national experts on best practices in juvenile justice.

We have set up a series of conference calls and meetings with representatives from across the county to discuss how to replace the training school and what is needed to accomplish closure.

Conversations were carried with Annie E Casey foundation who has a Juvenile Justice Strategy Group, with the Georgetown University Center for JJ Reform, and the Oregon Youth Authority. He is also scheduled to meet with the juvenile justice folks in Massachusetts.

Second, we are trying to get a better handle on right-sizing whatever facility or facilities replace CJTS. The Office for Research and Evaluation, part of Susan Smith's unit, has conducted a population projection and looked at the fact that the population of committed delinquents has been shrinking for over a decade. Ten years ago about 500 young people were committed delinquent on any given day. We are now averaging about 250 statewide, and the population continues to shrink even though the same number of kids are presenting to the juvenile court every year. This is a phenomenon around better services at the front end, probation and things they are doing to prevent kids from being committed delinquent. We have also been doing a better job moving kids out of the training school and keeping them in the community. Eighteen months ago, the population at CJTS was about 150. At the end of last week it was 42. Fewer young people are being housed in secure confinement.

Currently there are no girls at the Pueblo Unit. When this occurs, we pull the staff out of Pueblo onto the main CJTS campus in order to fill in for people out on workman's comp, etc. to control our overtime cost. We believe we can make do with a small (12-15 bed) (hardware) secure unit and about 30-40 staffed-secure beds elsewhere in the continuum. That would allow us to close CJTS altogether. We are looking for surplus state property as the department has met with public resistance in the past to open a juvenile facility in their neighborhood.

Third, we are meeting with the local LISTs, RACs and any groups to gather community input. We are conducting focus groups at the training school with both staff and young people that are there about what would work best.

We have tried to focus on ideas for community based services needed to facilitate having more kids in the community and fewer in whatever facility replaces CJTS.

We have also started looking at staffing patterns- and what we need in all the departments.

A lot of conversations are being carried about reinvesting the savings. It will be difficult to site any new programs anywhere. The only savings at CJTS would come from laying people off. 90% of the cost at CJTS is staffing and in order to create any savings, there will be layoffs. We have been up front with our staff about this. We are still staffed for 150 boys-and there were 42 boys last Friday.

Some of the input from the LISTs have been creative ways to use the excess staff.

The issues of transportation is a great barrier for many families in Willimantic and Torrington. The LIST recommends that we consider taking some of the excess staff at CJTS and creating a transportation unit whose only job would be transporting families to the facility for family treatment, and boys to programs.

Closing off sections at the actual CJTS location, removing the fence and splitting the campus in two is another recommendation.

The problem with using the CJTS location is perception and political. The fact that it was built during the Rowland administration, it is perceived to have connections to corruption. That it is a high security facility, politically it doesn't make sense. The Governor has asked us to back out of the facility all together.

Before the Governor made the call to close CJTS, the Commissioner invited an architect to look at the facility to decrease the level of security in parts of the campus, and to make living units feel more residential and less correctional. Although we have that information, the Governor wants us to back out altogether.

There has been some talk that other state agencies are interested in using the campus, such as DMHAS to replace Whiting Forensic, and DOC.

The Pueblo Unit, in the short term, will serve as the high security, small center that we need for the boys. We are in the planning stages –and have asked Bill Rosenbeck, the CJTS Director, to start testing out how Pueblo to operate completely on its own. Up to now, Pueblo has been operating and staffed as if it was a unit of CJTS. If there was any incident, they would make an all-staff call for support and staff from the main campus would go to Pueblo and help out as they would on any other unit of CJTS. We have now asked him to staff the unit in a way that it will require no outside support. We will actually move 8 – 10 of the higher risk boys to Pueblo. This will be tested out in the coming weeks and we will be notifying staff of any opportunity to transfer up there permanently.

The time line is a challenge. The legislature is considering legislation that would require us to close it by Jan 1 2017. State procurement rules make it difficult to build anything quickly. Anything that would cost more than ½ million dollars to build, requires an RFP and it has to go through the DAS Construction Division. As a department, we do not have the authority.

Re-opening the High Meadows Campus in Hampden was another recommendation. DCF already owns it and it is a residential treatment center. But our engineering folks say it would take 2 – 3 years to bring the residential units up to code. It has been closed since 2009 and at that time the only part that was refurbished was the school. It could take 2-3 years and a few million dollars.

There are no easy or quick answers. We are down to about 40 of the highest risk youth in the JJ population. We are not confident that turning to private providers is a good response either. We have 40% of all of the youth service officers out on workman's comp with injuries related to restraints. It is a high cost. Regarding the girls, we have about 6 or 7 beds available at Journey House.

The other issue we are facing is the legislation pending in the Governor's bills that would raise the age of juvenile court up to 20. Right now on the girls side we seem to have the capacity of handling it but if the age get raised to 20 we would need to create some other unit for young adult females from the age of 18 to 20. Journey House does a great job with the girls, but every once in a while we receive a call requesting us to take a girl causing disruptions they cannot handle.

The boys present a greater problem if the age is raised to 20. What is clear from the literature, is that you don't want your 20 and 15 year olds in the same unit. Will have to think of multiple age levels as well as multiple levels of security. The easiest part of it all is the closing of CJTS. The more difficult part is how we get the right services in the community given such a small population. When meeting at the smaller LISTs, like Stamford, Willimantic and Torrington and other places outside the four major cities, their concern is since you have only two or three committed delinquents at any given time from a given area, they know they will not get a full scale program. So another recommendation is that we expand the use of wrap around dollars-specifically for juvenile justice youth -so they can buy services a la carte in the outlying communities, addressing the problem of travel of great distances for the kids living in Danbury, Torrington and Waterbury as an example. These are some of the creative solutions.

We set up an email address: cjtsplan@ct.gov to receive feedback in terms of services from anyone in the community that is interested in submitting their ideas.

Mr. Muñiz has already met with six LISTs. They have given good ideas about vocational programing and transportation needed. They have identified the gaps in the community based –mental health service array-that would benefit some of the juvenile justice youth. Across the board the message from all the groups in the communities has been we need more services, more flexibility, but please don't put the facility in my community.

The following are the questions Mr. Muñiz has given to the LISTs to consider for their meeting:

1. Community supervision of youth -- What strategies, policies and/or programs are needed to keep more youth in the community rather than in locked settings?
2. Community-based programs -- What programs should we introduce or expand to help meet the needs of youth who would otherwise be served by DCF at CJTS?
3. Secure confinement -- What kind of settings do we need for the young people who need secure confinement?

Mr. Muñiz invited SAC to give any comments or questions about the process we are following –anything we should be doing to plan- and any recommendations or ideas about service gaps that exist in the community.

Timeframe. The timeframe is to finalize a plan by the summer at the latest. For Executive Branch agencies- we have to submit our legislative proposals and budget requests in August. In order to close by 2018, we will need to have this plan finalized by the summer (June 2016). The closure may even be earlier than the July 1, 2018, given the level of decreasing population and the budget crunch.

Comments, questions, suggestions:

Youth and employment.

Region 3 recently reviewed current community services for juvenile justice youth.

They found gaps around life skills and employment. Although the youth had been able to get internships or jobs, employers have asked for insurance from the providers. Since providers are unable to get insurance, the kids miss out on those jobs.

Mr. Muñiz noted that our JJ social workers are convinced that the difference between success and failure is employment.

Their perception is that it is employment that makes the difference for kids who do well in community supervision versus the kids that don't. It is not due to the program or mentoring.

Another suggestion was to contact in the department of education about developing a strong vocational tract for youth struggling in public school settings.

Job Corps was suggested since it has a proven record of success with the JJ kids.

Mr. Muñiz stated the department will revisit our relationship with Job Corp in CT. Our staff have expressed that they liked the out of state Job Corps better than the in-state. CT Job Corps non-tolerant drug/alcohol policy makes it very difficult for our kids to be admitted.

In addition, another program we are looking at in Massachusetts is an intensive community supervision program called ROCA. An observation from one of our providers in CT said if you read what they do, and you read what is done in CT, it doesn't appear they are doing anything different, except for one great philosophical difference which is you cannot fail out of ROCA. No matter what the kid does- fails the drug screen, doesn't show up- he cannot get himself out of ROCA. They stay with the youth throughout their entire delinquency commitment. It is a different mindset.

Run away problem. In absence of a secure facility, concern was noted that youth will not benefit from programs and services offered, if they run away. Mr. Muñiz agreed stating that a programmatic shift is being considered to make one unit hardware secure (where they physically cannot leave), and have another program that would be staff secure with authorization to physically stop kids from running. This is a significant issue.

Mr. Muñiz shared that when he meets with the national experts, having read all the research on smaller community based residential options for JJ youth, he asks them to name a place they endorse that CT could replicate. Not one of them has been able to answer the question- not Casey, Georgetown- none. Particularly when the topic is about the higher risk youth, it appears that no one knows what to do. We are on uncharted waters about how to do this effectively.

As an example, last month, at the Legislature, a national expert, a professor from the University of Cincinnati, who had done extensive research on programs and residential treatment for high end JJ youth, called the Missouri model, smoke and mirrors.

When the CJTS population was 150, CT had the fourth lowest incarceration rate in the country. Now that we are down to 40-45, we may actually be incarcerating fewer kids than anyone. Closing CJTS will come with some downside- a small setting is not going to have the vocational shops and the kind of programming that we are currently running. It cannot be run cost effectively for a population of 12 – 15 kids.

Ongoing challenges JJ youth face. Mr. Muñiz described some of the ongoing challenges for the JJ youth:

For those whose families live in public housing and have a felony, they literally cannot go home.

Since raise the age, we are also dealing with some 18 year olds. They were committed at 17- have turned 18 while with DCF and refusing family therapy.

Sometimes their families don't want them back.

Flags for prevention. What is it in the clinical makeup and history of these high risk youth that we should identify well in advance to prevent them going into the system?

DCF did a population profile of the boys at CJTS in October, and 85% of them have a parent with a history of substance abuse, mental health or co-appearing.

50% has a parent who had been in prison.

They are largely 2 to 3 grades behind upon admission.

They present with complex challenges and many with multiple challenges in their family history.

All the boys we get have been with CSSD, who have tried everything they have and were unsuccessful.

Often times they have child welfare history. If they don't and you look into their family history, they should have had a CPS.

Early on in their educational experience, somebody should have picked up that these children had families struggling with multiple issues.

DMHAS participation.

DCF has asked DMHAS Young Adult Services for their input on what they may need in the continuum to serve the older youth. In this budget cycle, DMHAS, DDS are taking significant cuts. From a Juan F. perspective, even if DCF didn't get cut, the budget cuts to DMHAS and DDS make it more difficult for DCF to do our job because we can't get the families the services they need. We are getting input from our sister agencies but not hopeful that they will be able to offer a lot.

How do judge decisions factor into this transition? - The Judicial Branch will take no official public position on this. Unofficially we have heard that judges are concerned about not having the CJTS option. The other decision makers at judicial are the probation officers and their decisions have a lot of influence. Probation is not bringing as many kids before judges, a factor contributing to fewer commitments. We are not sure what judicial will do as their population is also down dramatically. Their detention centers are about 20-25 kids with a capacity for 80. They may have to make some reductions as well.

Fernando welcomes input from SAC and from the individual RACs. He will gather the information you have requested and get it out to you. He also offered to visit the RACs if it would be helpful.

SAC extended their gratitude to Mr. Muñiz for his report.

Regional Advisory Council Updates

Region 1- Susan Sherrick- (no written report).

-Continued work with membership and identifying voting members. Have nine agencies and nine family representatives.

Holding one Saturday meeting per quarter and offering a speaker to arouse interest.

Will do mini-provider fair/summits, educational activities and tagging on the meeting to that. In each major city, Norwalk, Stamford and Bridgeport, first. Three different topics important in region 1: drug abuse and recovery, trafficking including social media, internet predators, Resiliency and suicide prevention.

They are interested in the CRP funds and have submitted their application. Co-chairs noted it will get processed today.

Region 2-Sarah Lockery- (attached *RAC/SAC Communication Forms -12.18.15(Attachment 3)) and report 2.26.16(Attachment 4).*

In December they held on of the four South Central Network of Care (SCNC) meetings which have been attended by an average of 60 people. Some confusion about RAC

- Developing work groups to focus on: Fatherhood, Recruitment of Foster Families, Obtain feedback from parents involved with protective services, and Prevention of minor sex trafficking with a presentation from Tammy Sneed.
- They request support from SAC on the review of RAC bylaws
- Need clarification of what is required when submitting the final report on the use of CRP funds: expense receipts, signed vouchers from parents
- Request to Commissioner: youths request access to Uber funds to help them maintain jobs. They would also benefit from having supportive adults in their lives to talk about job issues they encounter and to help them learn how to advocate for themselves when they face a problem at work.

Region 3-Samantha Forbes-(no written report)

- The new Communication plan was recently launched in region 3 and will be having a more formal list of items to present to SAC.
- The topic of fiduciary was very intense topic. The providers were generally hesitant to take on the responsibility citing that they have their own issues tracking their own paperwork. They pushed it back to the SAC asking if DCF could be the fiduciary.
- Fiduciary has the responsibility of maintaining appropriate documentation in case there is an audit.
- The RAC FAB will be holding Saturday meetings. The RAC members will be invited quarterly to the FAB meetings.
- Having support for grandparents caring for children. The clinic that are able to do this – have no CPT billing code that allows a support group. It is difficult some providers to have that service without reimbursement.

Region 4 – no report

Region 5-Deb Kelleher – (attached *RAC/SAC Communication Forms-12/31.15 (Attachment 5) and report - 2.25.16(Attachment 6)*)

At Dec 31st meeting had twenty attendees included 4 youth, 4 community members and 12 providers.

- Introduced the RAC/SAC Communication Form
- Youth want to be better informed about their rights while in care. Of the 4 youth present in the room- three were unaware of the Adolescent Bill of Rights and Responsibilities. The one who was aware was a young man who attends the YAB.
- Concern with lengthy of the process for permanency.

- Youth are asking for a response to their recommendations in the report they submitted to the Commissioner last year. They are looking for specific response from the Commissioner. In particular, the recommendation that foster parents be drug tested. They want to know what the Commissioner's office response-is it a good idea, would there be any movement toward that. Their point was that they worked very hard to develop the report and wanted feedback.
- The RAC notified Vanessa Dorantes, Regional Administrator, that the youth want better information about their rights while in care and the Adolescent Bill of Rights and Responsibilities. They will be talking with the adolescent workers to assure youth are aware of this document.

The February 26 meeting was the first Multi-site meeting via phone conference. The meeting was held in Waterbury, with telephone conferencing into Torrington and Danbury. Twenty five attendees participated. Waterbury had 4, three were youth. Torrington 1 and 4 in Danbury, one a parent.

- ISS Executive Planning Committee –is becoming the hub where issues identified by the planning committee are brought to the RAC and then communicated back to the providers and region and to the level of statewide if it gets to that.
- Discussion about the DCF Adolescent Bill of Rights continued.
- A web page was created on the Annie C website with RAC materials and minutes available to the group.
- They started a recruitment team to get diversity in the in the RAC.

In terms of process, extensive discussion was carried regarding the flow of information and feedback to RACs. The RACs are intended to advise regionally and locally and then bring the information to the SAC as a way to identify common themes. Once this is completed, those common themes are then sent to the Commissioner. Part of what the retreat accomplished going forward (this year) –was establishing the back and forth of feedback vetted through the SAC. The 2014 CRP funds had the obligation to submit that annual report, which contributed to the development of the agenda for the SAC Retreat and the structure for better communication between RAC and SAC.

In response to the concerns from Region 5 about response/feedback to their annual report recommendations, Ms. Moller clarified that the annual reports from last year were used to build the agenda for the 2015 SAC Retreat. Additionally, if the recommendations were not addressed at the retreat, given that the Regional Administrator attends the RAC meetings, they would be able to bring recommendations or concerns from their region to the Commissioner, who is their direct supervisor.

SAC stressed the importance of presence of the Regional Administrator at the RAC meetings.

SAC recommended that this information be brought back to the RAC so they understand the structure of the communication flow.

Clarification from Susan Smith: when referring to the box in the form, "*Request for issue/concern/idea to be presented to the DCF Commissioner,*" the presumption is that the RAC has vetted it and felt that it needs to go higher than the regional level. All agreed.

Susan informed the group that the Youth Advisory Board had the ear of the Commissioner. They meet quarterly, they created the Adolescent Bill of Rights and now they are drafting a normalcy document. A lot of the youth concerns are brought through the YAB, and Commissioner and other Senior Administrators attend that meetings. More importantly we have youth who are on the New England Youth Advisories so that normalcy policy is actually being adopted by the New England States. It would be very significant for the YAB to have a nexus with the individual RACs.

The co-chair will send an email to the Region 5 RAC acknowledging their concern about feedback to their annual report and recommendations.

Place on the agenda for next meeting: Review of the Bylaws

Region 6- Elizabeth Cannata (attached *RAC/SAC Communication Form -3/3/16* (Attachment 7)

- Have three active workgroups- Membership, Father Engagement in terms of how DCF engages/treats fathers and activities that could pull fathers in, and Enhancing Transition Supports for Youth in Foster Care aging out of the system. It is very evident that the youth want to know who is hearing them. At a recent Region 5 RAC meeting, she heard their discussions and voice their concern about that point when they sign themselves out, saying, "and we don't know what is best for us. Having heard it first hand, Ms. Cannata is now citing their concern everywhere this topic arises, including in in Region 6 when working on transition supports.

- Request for SAC from Region 6: Could they get some data that would be helpful in their planning. Is there data about how many transition age youth get picked up by young adult service. How many who are aging out of the DCF system are referred, picked up, rejected. Is there any data about youth who are not referred for young adult services, because they are successfully closed but it turns out their needs are greater and now they enter the system. (Susan noted DMHAS would have the post eighteen information.)
- The RAC 6 has invited key people from DSS and local providers for young adult transition services to attend some workgroup meetings in order to obtain as much information as possible. They don't have to commit to attending RAC in an on-going way but attending workgroup meetings.

DCF Updates –

CFSR The CFSR is the Child and Family Service Review and occurs every 4-5 years, implemented by the feds (Children's Bureau) to look at compliance with federal expectations for child welfare services. In the past feds came onsite for one-week doing case reviews and then a variety of stakeholder interviews. Reintroduced the *Children's Bureau CFSR Fact Sheet* (Attachment 8).

This year the process is similar-however- states have been given the opportunity to do our own self-directed reviews, but still required to comporting with the expectations feds have outlined. We have to go through a rigorous process in order to be authorized and DCF is pleased to report we were approved for self-directed review. This is very important for us as we advance our quality assurance and CQI framework. The feds will be monitoring and doing oversight to assure it is done with efficacy and integrity. They will be coming on-site to conduct stakeholder interviews that will also be occurring in May or June.

Within the next couple of months, we are hoping to tie an interview to one of our SAC meetings so they can address SAC directly about the function of the service system and the service array and other things of that nature. Your involvement as a SAC would be appreciated and we would invite other folks to come in that day. There will also be opportunities that folks working with some of our families will also be asked to do interviews specific to the families that they are working with. I ask if you receive a call please support them by speaking with our review staff to obtain that information because it is critical for us in order to effectively rate the service system.

In the history of the CFSR –there is no state agency that has escaped getting a Performance Improvement Plan. There are a variety of factors that states have to comply with and no state is exempt. It gives states the ability to talk about what their efforts will be to achieve some of those areas and enhance other aspects of the work.

We are prepared for that. We know that it is coming and we know there are penalties in you don't comply. We want to make sure we have robust information as we go through these processes. The reviewers are DCF employees and if you have any questions they will be able to address them.

Our CFSR begins on April 1. It will be concomitant with our next meeting. Do we want them to come to one of our standing meetings, or hold a separate meeting? The SAC is an appropriate body to include. We prefer that people come to SAC meeting as a place to get feedback because it would also serve SAC to hear as well.

They require 1 ½ - 2 hours to make sure everyone has voice- and it is directed by federal representatives who come onsite and carry these discussions.

We have been using a variety of DCF staff to do those case reviews from all different sectors. Some of our folks are from the ACR, some oversee services, and some from facilities (Solnit, CJTS) so we are trying to get a wide representation of folks to participate.

For the Performance Improvement Plan (PIP), we are considering extending to have other folks be part of the review process, so again if folks are interested or know of someone who might be interested in being a reviewer please contact Susan Smith. This is not imminent, as it would be in 2017. We would like to expand it and have folks outside the department who are participating in the review. You get training, maybe stipend for folks who would not be compensated otherwise, but including other folks would be helpful to us. If you want more information we can invite Lynette Warner (Director of the Office of Research and Evaluation) who is spear heading presentations on the training process and its demands.

Ms. Smith was asked if this was separate from the legislation review group that Josh Howroyd shared at the RAC 3 meeting regarding pending legislation. Ms. Smith responded that there was a bill raised that dealt with FAR (Family Assessment Response) in which one of the concepts was the potential development of an advisory board specific to FAR. This was discussed with the co-chairs, Regina and Elizabeth, to be award that SAC needs to think about it because at some level SAC already does that as a SAC and CRP and how would something like that interact with your current work. When you think of differential response (DR), that is our whole system. You have two different response tracts, but effectively as a CRP and as a SAC that's your legislative responsibility to provide advisement. For those who are not aware, we have a contract with University of CT (since 2013) to actually be an independent evaluator of the FAR system.

We have those folks come in and pull the data and develop quarterly reports. They can come to present to SAC and you can provide advisement. Ms. Smith alerted the chairs because if a FAR advisory board were to come fruition, we have figure out how we can make that connect here to SAC.

Discussion was carried regarding the agenda and the meeting time frame, and more information about what a review would entail. Concern was expressed about the need for more time to meaningfully attend to all of the things SAC would like to attend to.

Ms. Moller asked if it would be possible to obtain a copy of the CFSR guidelines. Susan Smith will send a website to SAC. In addition to the bylaws at the next meeting, the CFSR Review Questions will be added to the agenda. It would give SAC and opportunity to review as a group, and be prepared with our responses for the reviewers. We can also discuss scheduling a meeting or workgroup to have a representative from SAC to meet with them in May.

New Data Portal System. Susan introduced and demonstrated the link to the DCF Data Connect, recently launched to consolidate where we are putting data and reports. They are publically facing report with non-identifiable materials. As mentioned at the last meeting, the Governor's Executive Order 39, required all executive branch agencies to provide a data portal. It includes 15 years of CIP (children in placement) non-identifiable data. Information you can look at in terms of race, gender, age etc.

It is a lot easier for key stakeholders to have access to information about us, as well as for us in the course of our work. It includes data dashboards which you are seeing presented at your regions, disproportionality (3-4 years), pathway data, legislative reports for the last two years, several of our internal reports, i.e., the 0-3 fatality study and domestic minor sex trafficking. There is an alphabetical listing of what is included in the data portal.

Questions posed:

Can the RBA report cards the department is creating be posted for providers to be aware of the proposed actions to be able to work in concert? Ms. Smith responded that some have been posted but that the expectation is that PDOCs are sharing that with all of you. She will bring this information back because the expectation that they are relaying the information.

Is there data available on Amber Alerts and where they are occurring? In an effort to get superintendents to the table to discuss trafficking issues, we need to show that it may be happening in their community with a correlation to Amber Alerts. Ms. Smith was not will look into it but it may be the State Police.

For next meeting agenda: RAC Bylaws, CFSR Review Questions, and possibly Sara Lourie.

The RACs need to present the LIST questions – and the email for RAC membership comments. Responses questions and comments about LIST should be included in the RAC SAC Communication Form.

Regina Moller with will bring and have on hand the 20 gift cards for use as stipends beginning at the April 4 meeting. Brief discussion was carried about the benefit of Walmart cards as opposed to the Stop and Shop. SAC decided to carry Walmart cards.

SAC members considered changing the time of the SAC meetings beginning with April 4 in order to accommodate for the work of SAC. A vote was taken. To hold the meeting at 9:30a – 12N - five votes; 9a – 11:30 - two votes; stay the same and cut agenda down –zero votes. The April 4 meeting will begin at 9:30am and continue to 12 Noon in order to complete the agenda. This time change will continue for all SAC meetings.

Meeting ended at 11:35am.