



**REGULAR MEETING  
MINUTES  
JANUARY 9, 2009  
County Administration Center**

**Voting Members Present**

Mary Baum; Valerie Bickel (for Sheriff Bill Kolender); Kim Broderick (for Mack Jenkins); JoAnne Bushby; Amethyst Cureg (for Wilma Wooten); Margarita de Ruyter; Dixie Galapon (for Margaret Iwanaga-Penrose); Nina Garrett (for Carlos Flores); Hon. Susan Golding; Paula Guerra; Philip Hanger (for Alfredo Aguirre); Mary Harris; Margarita Holguin; Kathryn Ingrum (for Michelle Soltero); Paula Ingrum (for Sandra McBrayer); Sharon Lawrence; Michele Linley (for Bonnie Dumanis); Loretta Middleton (for Randolph Ward); Rev. Nancy Mitchell; Maddy Morris; Lynn Ceresino Neault (for Constance Carroll); John Philips (for John Sansone); Walter Philips; Arun Ramanathan, (for Terry Grier); Vivian Reznik; Meredith Riffel; Barbara Ryan; Pam Smith (for Nick Macchione); Katherine Smith-Brooks; Donald Stump; Daphne Watson

**Alternate Members Present**

Debbie Comstock; Roseann Myers

**Visitors Present**

Karim Bouris (San Diego Foster Youth Initiative); J.R. Edwards; Barbara Mandel Pache (San Diego Grantmakers); Tami Rapozo (Jewish Family Service of SD); Richele Swagler (Child Welfare Services); Antonia Torres (Child Welfare Services); Bruce Wexler (Fred Finch Youth Center)

**Staff Present**

Vicki Devine, Harold Randolph, Tonya Torosian

**I. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m. by Dr. Vivian Reznik, Vice Chair. Everyone present introduced themselves, stating their name and affiliation.

**II. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**III. Approval of the Minutes – November 7, 2008**

- ♦ The approval of the November 7, 2008 minutes has been postponed until the next Commission meeting on March 6, 2009.

**IV. Report from the Chair**

- ♦ The Commission is making an effort to "Go Green" and increase efficiency by sending electronic copies of materials in place of hard copies. Thank you for your support in this effort. If you have any problems receiving or opening the documents, please contact Vicki Devine for assistance.
- ♦ Recently the Commission changed its email communication system to Constant Contact. Please be sure you do not opt out of this system when you receive an email, or you will no longer receive Commission notices, agendas and other information.

- ♦ April is Child Abuse Prevention Month and planning is underway for Child Abuse Prevention Month activities. We will be hosting the annual STARS Awards and will be looking to each of you for nominations of individuals making a positive impact on the prevention of child abuse. Additional details will be sent to you as the event approaches.

## V. Action Items

- A. FY 2009-2010 & 2010-2011 Operational Planning Advisory Board Input – *Dr. Vivian Reznik & Tonya Torosian*  
Today's recommended action will approve the CCYF Advisory Board Input for Fiscal Year 09-2010 & 2010-2011.

Dr. Reznik reported that Nick Macchione, Health and Human Services Director, requested the Commission, along with other advisory boards, provide recommendations for the FY 09-10 and FY 2010-11 Operational Plans. A discussion and vote on these recommendations will be required. The Commission completed a similar process in 2004 when the County was facing challenging budget issues. At that time, the Commission spent a great deal of time in subcommittees and regularly scheduled meetings discussing and rating programs as High, Medium or Low Priority. Since many of the program and services remain the same as they were in 2004, it may be possible to confirm these rankings as a whole as ranked in 2004, unless there are any updates that need to be discussed.

To accomplish the 2009-2010 task, we will first look to confirm (or adjust as necessary) the 2004 rankings of program and services. Secondly, we will be ranking an additional seven contracted services or programs that have been added since 2004.

Dr. Vivian Reznik opened up the discussion, referring to the Fiscal Years 2009-10 & 2010-11 Operational Planning Advisory Board Input Matrix, that had been emailed to the Commission Members and their alternates. Many members voiced their concerns, comments and questions as follows:

- ♦ Regarding the approval of taking the 2004 rankings forward as our current rankings, a comment was made that someone was uncomfortable with a blanket statement of "these are program priorities" that will be going to the Board of Supervisors. It was noted that during the 2004 process, the Commission was provided with program descriptions, approximately how many were served by each program, goals, outcomes, and were objectives being met.
- ♦ Some programs are mandatory and the County has no choice on whether or not to implement them.
- ♦ Line up the Report Card recommendations with recommendations around funding to make sure we are consistent in the different documents passing through the Commission.
- ♦ Funding streams - What are the funding and revenues that are being used to fund these programs?
- ♦ Not enough information on who funded the programs, who each program serves, the cost per client, the outcome, and the risk to the community.
- ♦ Concerns over the short timeline for this request were also made.
- ♦ Several members on other Community Advisory Committees reported all were given the same information and timelines for completion and that they did the best they could knowing that the information was incomplete.
- ♦ It was noted that it was better to weigh in on the Commission's recommendations than not at all - even if all the information we feel is necessary to make these tough decisions is unavailable.

Given the concerns voiced, Tonya Torosian mentioned that there were a couple of options that the Commission could consider in order to go move forward on the recommendations. One option is to ask for additional time like we did in 2004 and complete this discussion after acquiring more data. Another option is make a broad recommendation of our guiding principles and framework for assessing these programs with the hopes this will be applied to the County Executive's assessment of each program when making its final determinations. Tonya reviewed the framework used last time to make 2004 and stated we could tie these back to the Report Card.

The group was not comfortable with a general statement as our final recommendation but also was not comfortable making determinations based on the information and short timeline provided.

Dr. Reznik suggested the Commission either:

- 1) Not weigh in due to circumstances beyond our control which has set the timeframe and give a broad statement.
- 2) Give everyone a week or so to review the recommendations with as much data as we have, which will require another meeting.

Her recommendation was to have our voice heard and do what we can to set some priorities today; certainly with the new programs and then have a follow up meeting in a week and in the meantime try to gather as much information as possible from Child Welfare Services. Tonya Torosian reported that a special meeting may be held in place of the upcoming Executive Committee meeting on January 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Dr. Reznik recommended that the Commission discuss the seven new programs today due to time constraints, and asked for staff to group the remaining programs by categories of what kind of programs they are, and provide whatever information is available, and continue the discussion on the 23<sup>rd</sup>. Dr. Reznik encouraged everyone to come to the meeting since we will need to vote on our recommendations which will require a quorum.

Tonya Torosian will gather as much data that is available and email it to the Commission, and provide further details of the Executive Committee meeting, which will be held at the Polinsky Pavilion at 9440A Ruffin Court, Room 15/16, on January 23<sup>rd</sup> from 2:00-4:00pm.

One member brought up a concern that some of the members are providers and maybe should not participate in the discussion in case of potential conflict of interest. The Commission will seek advice of County Counsel on this issue.

The members proceeded to review and discuss the following new programs which will be revisited on the 23<sup>rd</sup> for actual voting:

- ♦ Community Services for Families – Services Child Welfare Services offers to families either at the prevention level or for families who are at immediate risk or have had their children removed. These services help CWS attempt to remediate whatever the abuse or neglect issue was, and demonstrates to the judicial system that CWS provided reasonable services to the families to help them reunify. This is the largest part of the Commission's Spending Plan that was approved in November, and the Commission values this as a high priority. *Recommended Rating From Commission: HIGH*
- ♦ Family Finding – Started as a Central Region Pilot looking at disproportionality and is currently used through a contract through Mental Health Services to look at children who are in care and try every means possible to find and locate either family significant others that want to establish a relationship with the child and/or as a potential placement for the child. It is also a strategy by which we hope to return children who have been in foster care for several years and who have not gone back to their parents or have not been adopted. Over a course of time they frequently lose touch with relatives and extended family members who may assume they may have been adopted. CWS has been successful in reconnecting at least 60 children so far with extended family members and reestablishing those relationships. This is a cost-effective program per Mary Harris. The current contract is for \$500,000 and translates to about one month in group home care per child, which amounts to \$6,000 or slightly less per child. The source for funding is a state funding stream called Intensive Family Preservation, which can also be used for family preservation services. Mary Harris will provide information on what percentage of kids go back to extended families. *Recommended Rating From Commission: HIGH*
- ♦ Multi Systemic Therapy – Mary Harris said this is a fairly small program that CWS contracts with the San Diego School District. This program worked well for Probation, and we fund this very small contract, around \$200,000 of Family Preservation State Funds. It targets primarily teenagers who come to our attention and are at risk of removal from the parental home, when the primary issues are out of control. CWS is able to refer to this service that works intensively with

- the parents and the teenager to get the situation back under control. Kim Broderick said this is an evidence-based practice, part of the blueprint model – eleven evidence-based practices functional family therapy. Probation has used it with their probation kids, usually kids who have oppositional defiant or conduct disorder, and have found it to be very effective. It is costly because it is a seven day, 24 hour program, with therapists who respond to issues, have small caseloads of 4 to 6 kids, for up to six months. Studies have proven that this program does work.
- ♦ School Success – This is a program that was recently enhanced through a private grant. It provides more support to kids in foster care tending to their educational needs. There will be one Education Liaison in each region making sure the correct linkage to the school is met, following up with transfer of placement, and making sure nothing is lost or missed in the child's education, as well as facilitating other support to that youth. The seven Education Liaisons are just arriving this month so no outcomes are available yet. This is funded by Stuart Foundation, Casey Foundation, Qualcomm, and other foundation funding, and also leverage Title IV-E Funding to pay for this program. The goal is to improve the academic success of children in foster care. The liaisons will be sitting out with the child welfare workers in their offices to access services. East had a lot of success. They had a social worker who became the contact person for all the social workers and all the schools and foster homes. They had great outcomes with keeping kids, measuring the stabilization in the school. All outcomes measured have been outstanding. Maddy Morris mentioned that Supervisor Cox championed this program and highlighted it in his State of the County Address last year and said this is a project he will be following and is committed to raising money if need be, and would like to see it continue.
  - ♦ Respite (foster parents) – Providing foster parents a break and support for people caring for relative placement.
  - ♦ Child Sexual Abuse Treatment – Tonya Torosian to gather more information on this program.
  - ♦ Special Education Legal Advocacy – Tonya Torosian to gather more information on this program.

Dr. Reznik re-iterated that the Commission will proceed with the recommendations and vote on January 23<sup>rd</sup> at the Special Session Meeting, and encouraged Commission members to attend this meeting.

## VI. Roundtable Discussion

Child Abuse Prevention in San Diego County: Facilitated by Lisa Molinar – Shared Vision Consultants

- Review of the County Self-Assessment and discussion of prevention and intervention strategies and input into the CAPIT / CBCAP & PSS Three-Year Plan.

Lisa Molinar joined the meeting today to provide an overview of the County SIP Process and the CAPIT / CBCAP & PSS Three-Year Plan to gain feedback from Commission members on San Diego County prevention services and strategies. She distributed the following handouts: 1) Guiding Principles of the County System Improvement Plan (SIP); 2) 2009 System Improvement Plan (SIP) Forums.

- ♦ Scope of County Self-Assessment, SIP and CAPIT/ CBCAP/PSSF 3-Year Plan.
- ♦ California Child and Family Services Review (C-CFSR) – C-CFSR Cycle with a Comprehensive Assessment.
- ♦ County System Improvement Plan (SIP) – The SIP is a culmination of PQCR and CSA. It will have an outline by looking at specific Child Welfare Services improvement outcomes. This is an agreement between the County and the State and is coordinated with the Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention Plan and will be submitted to the Board of Supervisors for approval in May, and will then be forwarded to the California Department of Social Services.
- ♦ During the CSA, there was a focus group which discussed child abuse prevention and intervention. This group identified strengths and areas in need of improvement for San Diego County. Strengths identified included – Team Decision Meetings, parent peer support, and the home visiting services.
- ♦ Areas Needing Improvement – Use of community-based service providers and schools as points of engagement; provide a positive parenting message versus a child abuse prevention message; culturally appropriate interventions; valuing work of substitute care providers and highlighting the positive outcomes; and, strategies to minimize the negative perception or stigma attached to a child that has had multiple placements.
- ♦ Existing Strategies Utilized by Child Welfare: evidence-based practices and programs including: Safe Care; KEEP; Incredible Years; Triple P; expanded services for relative caregivers through

school-based FRC; continued support for Family Visitation Centers and Adoption Support Services; and continued training such as Diversity Schoolhouse.

- ♦ Strategies for the Future – Child abuse prevention should utilize positive messages to engage the community; positive messaging on effective parenting rather than on child abuse; and utilize schools to distribute information to families and other community based consumer run organizations.

Ms. Molinar said Child Welfare Services are now moving forward into the System Improvement Planning process. Upcoming Stakeholder Forums will be held (refer to 2<sup>nd</sup> handout). Four focus/outcome areas will be looked at which includes: Adoptions within twenty-four months; timely reunification (reunification within twelve months); adult transitioning emancipating youth; and placement stability. Members had a discussion about prevention and intervention strategies. Some of their comments were:

- ♦ Leverage dollars to expand and provide more prevention.
- ♦ Develop prevention strategies (data) – key indicators we can focus on.
- ♦ Recognize any duplication of services.

Members discussed prevention and strategies. The Child Abuse Prevention Foundation is interested in helping raise money and would like to know what would work so they could help implement a community wide program that would touch a large percentage of parents that need information and do not have it. They are considering creating a new DVD in multi-languages that families and children can use to be distributed to schools. In the past few years the Commission has made a lot of strategies in bringing up programs that really addressed issues. The Commission has made progress on our goals of improving safety and well-being. Schools are one of our strategies for the future; they are looking to us for child prevention. Another strategy suggestion is to bring the community together such as a city planner, child welfare service worker, library director, health official, etc., to look at the overall health of our community and neighborhood. Many members voiced their concerns that if budget issues cause the closing of parks and other recreation activities, it could directly affect an increase in juvenile crimes. One suggestion was to ask retired adults to volunteer to work with and mentor children. Ms. Molinar thanked everyone for participating in this discussion and invited everyone to attend upcoming forums. She will be back in March to provide an update on the forum meetings and discuss the System Improvement Plan.

**VII. Additional Business**

**VIII. Announcements**

**IX. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Written by Vicki Devine