Steering Committee on Reduction of African American Child Death

January 21, 2015
2:15 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.
Bannon Island Room
Sierra Health Foundation

Meeting Outcomes:
• Review penultimate strategic plan report draft
• Increase readiness for BOS presentation
• Discuss & Review Sacramento County’s IV-E Waiver

2:15 p.m.  Welcome and Report Out
Wendy Petko and Chet Hewitt
Co-Chairs, Steering Committee on Reduction of African American Child Death
▪ Review previous meeting minutes
▪ Introduction of & Overview of the Review Workgroup’s Tasks

2:20 p.m.  Strategic Plan Report Review
Review Group
Steering Committee on Reduction of African American Child Death
▪ Review of Penultimate Strategic Plan Report Draft

3:00 p.m.  Departing from Strategic Planning to Strategic Action
Wendy Petko and Chet Hewitt
Co-Chairs, Steering Committee on Reduction of African American Child Death
▪ Tentative Presentation Date(s)
▪ Activating Our Strategic Plan & Impactful Quick Wins
▪ Preparing for Presentation, Collective Turnout and Roles

3:30 p.m.  Discussion of Sacramento County’s IV-E Waiver
Sherri Heller, Director, Sacramento County Dept. Health and Human Services
Lee Seale, Chief Probation Officer, Sacramento County Department of Probation
Michelle Callejas, Deputy Director, Child Protective Services
▪ Review of Sacramento’s IV-E Waiver Approach
▪ Discuss connection of IV-E Waiver to RAACD Strategic Plan

4:10 p.m.  Moving Forward in 2015: Next Steps and Meeting Evaluation
▪ Meeting Evaluation – Identify Presenters/Topics as Aligned with Strategic Plan
▪ Evaluation Workgroup Meeting Date: January 27th, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
▪ Next meeting: February 18th, 2:15 p.m. - 4:15 p.m.

4:15 p.m.  Adjourn
Steering Committee of Reduction of African American Child Deaths

January 21, 2015
2:15-4:15
Sierra Health Foundation
1321 Garden Highway
Meeting Summary Notes

Attendees:

**Steering Committee Members:** Debra Cummings, Ethan Cutts, Paris Dye, Addie Ellis, Linda Fong-Somera, Diane Galati, Keith Herron, Chet Hewitt, Olivia Kasirye, Barry Loncke, Leslie Moore, Robert Moynihan, Wendy Petko, Gina Roberson, Tina Roberts, Essence Webb, Natalie Woods Andrews

**Center Staff:** Robert Phillips, Leslie Cooksy, Diane Littlefield, Madeline Sabatoni, bel Reyes, Kari Lacosta, Kindra Montgomery-Block

**Guests:** Marlon Yarber, Lee Seale, Keith Bays, Brian Lee, Sherri Z. Heller, Michelle Callejas, Laura Z. Jacobs, Dallas Butterfield, Ross Schneider, Alma Caravarin, Mike Greenwell, Kelsea Keppinger, Karen Nichols

**Not Present:**

**Steering Committee Members:** Gladys Deloney, Darcel Lee, Tyrone Netters, Cary Trzcinski

**Excused Absence:** Pastor Alice Baber-Banks, Pastor Robert Jones, Kim Pearson, James Shelby

**Meeting called to order:**

2:21pm

Wendy Petko reviewed the minutes. Dr. Cutts gave a brief background on the review team and the process of reviewing the report, noting that the review team had previously reviewed the draft of the plan and the current iteration was revised based on review. Chet gave a background on the development of the strategic plan. Chet specifically noted that the plan was revised to include youth, as advised by the last Steering Committee meeting. Staff built the plan into a narrative from the outline last presented. The December meeting was postponed to further develop and revise the plan with input from the review workgroup. The document is a policy-level document and the penultimate draft has been presented to the full Steering Committee.

**Discussion of Strategic Plan Draft**

Presenter: Dr. Ethan Cutts

Dr. Cutts asked to review the draft in sections. For sections not listed, there were no comments.

**Section: Co-Chair Letter (please see strategic report penultimate draft)**

- Recommended that the letter highlights allocation of appropriate funding and redesigning systems
• This letter can be edited as changes are made during implementation design

Section: Background (please see strategic report penultimate draft)
• The Steering Committee discussed consistency of statements noting serving all African American children versus serving all children, with the goal of reducing disproportionality.
• The Steering Committee had previously decided to note that all kids will benefit, but focus on the charge of the committee
• Previous mission/vision documents from the committee will be consulted

Section: RAACD Strategic Plan (please see strategic report penultimate draft)
• The committee discussed feasibility of the goal related to the development of the ICPC (Priority Outcome 2). It was noted that we need to let the Board of Supervisors know what we’re aiming for, that this is a different strategy, etc.
• The committee discussed the possibility of tagging onto other existing policy councils, but decided that this issue would be placed on a backburner
• The committee discussed the use of the ICPC as a high-level negotiation tactic
• The committee noted that this will be a tough discussion point and uncomfortable for some, but necessary to move forward

Additional changes discussed – such as wording or terms on specific items – will be added to the final report.

Departing from Strategic Planning to Strategic Action
• Our tentative date to present to the Board of Supervisors is April 7. Staff is working with Assistant County Administrator, Paul Lake, on the logistics.

Title IV-E Presentation (please see attached presentation)
Presenters: Sherri Heller, Lee Seale, Michelle Callejas
• Title IV-E refers to a waiver of funding rules for federal funding regarding out of home placement. This demonstration seeks to prove that the county can save money by reducing out of home placements
• The county wants to spend money on: aunts/uncles who take kids in and preventative services
• If the first thing focused on is the highest risk kids (those in group homes) – those in the most expensive placements – then there will be more funding to reinvest. The order of priorities is important
• This is a five year program and money can roll over year to year.
• The notice does not say “reduce deaths” though that’s what the Steering Committee is interested in, but it is not what the County will be evaluated on. Currently Sac County has seen an increase in caseloads/re-entry and is not going in the right direction. Chet noted that death is a by-product and that there is a lot of alignment in our work.
• Sherri noted the need to have real dialogue and that this is opening a conversation that we need to have over the next five years
• Chet noted that this waiver does not have partisan leanings – as cost savings are popular for both parties. If California is able to bring the cost down, they believe that it can be sustained. The fear is in failure.

• There is an opportunity for new contracts if there is savings. Michelle noted that contracts are currently in prevention and permanency: the best option is to keep the child in the home and they are working with CAP-C, by investing in child resource centers. First5 did this for ages under five and now this money can be used to expand this to age 18. CAP-C shows significant positive outcomes and can refer to nine resource centers for differential response. This is significantly better outcomes than in the child welfare system.

• Permanency programs are through Sierra Forever Families/Liliput Services, which includes intensive family finding – trying to find relatives who can be “forever family”. We want to step up placements with relatives for youth to have better outcomes. Currently these placements are at 24% and we want them at 50% by Dec 2015. Destination Families is a program for older youth who have been in care for too long. Another program is Safety Organized Practice (to meet the required one common practice), which is solution based interviewing. Previously they had used signs of safety. This will help achieve more family and youth engagement. Community meetings indicated a need for more drug and alcohol services. They are considering bringing back a program that reduced African American called Connections run by Liliput in 2007-8, that had reduced funding due to budget cuts.

• The Steering Committee requested a list of the contracts with amounts

• There is no due date for spending, because they can make amendments to plan. They currently have not spent all the money and are trying to have reserves, especially because they are currently not moving in the right direction. They go to the Board of Supervisors March 10.

• The Family Maintenance Program is very similar to a program that had budget cuts, but still have informal supervision. This currently only serves kids ages 0-5 due to capacity

• Probation: Started by focusing on the right kids in the right services. There has been a focus on high-risk, high-needs for so long, there hasn’t been as much work on prevention. Three prevention services: wraparound (which every Probation Dept has to do) and can serve up to 125 families, Functional Family Therapy which provide services in home with family case planning and Multi-Systemic Therapy, which is recidivism focused. The goal is reduce out-of-home placements by 25%. Most often this is group home care. We can use savings for 19 year olds to help them become employable and get off probation.

Q&A

• It is unknown if there is a longitudinal study for kids reunited with families

• Utilization of the school system involves Probation Officers at SCOE sites – providing assistance to students (making sure they’re at school) and working with SCUSD. There are officers at middle school sites.

• There is not real clear research on reunification, but stable placements are key. In Sac County, reunifications haven’t been stable. We need support for families.

• There are programs that focus on teaching kids compassion including Thinking for Change. There are a number of programs to work with ids to think a different way.
• Gina noted that CAP-C does the Child Death Review Team because child deaths are the tip of the iceberg – their causes give a glimpse of the conditions children are living in and provide a number of policy/practice recommendations. Also, 3rd Party Homicides have a lot of alignment and continuation for dialogue.

• Sherri noted that there is not unwillingness in investing money in programs that reduce child death, but its focus could lead to flunking the federal audit. Policy objectives don’t always match audit objectives. Lee said there is a lot of overlap and there’s nothing on the list we don’t care about.

• Sherri said that there might be good reason to move money around. Do not think of us as an obstacle, but that we’re trying to give valuable tips (like when suggesting we look at realignment funds vs Title IV-E Funds)

Closing Items
• The Evaluation Workgroup will be meeting on January 27 from 3-5pm at Sierra Health Foundation.
• The next Steering Committee meeting is February 18
• Steering Committee members are invited to attend the Title IV-E Demonstration Project Presentation on February 17 from 4-7pm at the Board of Supervisors Chambers. Part of this meeting will be to discuss the plan for the remaining funds.

Meeting adjourned:
4:15pm
Reduction of African American Child Deaths in Sacramento County

Steering Committee Meeting

January 21, 2015
2:15 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.
Meeting Outcomes:

• To review penultimate strategic plan report draft
• To increase readiness for BOS presentation
• To discuss Sacramento County’s IV-E Waiver
Agenda

2:15 p.m.  Welcome and Report Out
Wendy Petko and Chet Hewitt
Co-Chairs, Steering Committee on Reduction of African American Child Death

2:20 p.m.  Strategic Plan Report Review

3:30 p.m.  Departing from Strategic Planning to Strategic Action

3:45 p.m.  Discussion of Sacramento County’s IV-E Wavier

4:10 p.m.  Moving Forward in 2015: Next Steps & Meeting Evaluation

4:15 p.m.  Adjourn
Welcome and Report Out
Strategic Plan Report Review
Steering Committee on the Reduction of African American Child Deaths  
Strategic Plan Report Reviewer Guide

This reviewer guide is intended to gather your feedback on the draft Strategic Plan Report. Statements are provided for each section of the report to help guide your critical review process. After reviewing each section of the draft Strategic Plan Report, please indicate your level of support (use scale to indicate agreement) and provide comments or suggestions as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:6</td>
<td>The letter from co-chairs emphasizes the importance of the Steering Committee's Strategic Plan to reduce African American child deaths in Sacramento County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
Reviewing the Strategic Plan Report

Steps:

1. **Brief Review** of each section of the report.

2. **Provide Feedback & Suggestions/Comments** focused on sections that you have indicated a “2” or “3” using the Reviewer Guide provided.

3. **Discussion** – what is your overall feedback, thoughts, questions and/or concerns?
Moving from Strategic Planning to Strategic Action
Activating Our Strategic Plan and Gaining Quick Wins

• Development of our Implementation Plan – moving from the What to the How

• Preparing for our Board of Supervisors Presentation - Tentatively scheduled for April 7th
What do we need to do to prepare?

1. **Prep** for Public Comment
2. **Turnout** – PACK the Chamber with support
3. **Roles** – Co-Chairs will be the spokespeople, BUT members are needed for public comment and to encourage community members to attend.
Board of Supervisors
Meeting
Information Sheet

Sacramento County Board of Supervisors
Board Meeting Information

You may address the Board on items on the agenda upon recognition by the Chair of the Board. Comments should be limited to three minutes so everyone may be heard.

Speaking to the Board for Public Comment

- Complete a form (available in Board Chambers) and give to the Clerk.
- Make your statement as brief and concise as possible, and be prepared to answer questions.
- A written statement (additional details below) is best for detailed or complicated information. One copy should be provided for each Board Member and the Clerk. Additional copies for the news media are helpful.
- Written statements/comments may also be made online.

Public Written Statement/Comment on a Meeting Agenda Item

You can submit written statements/comments about specific Board of Supervisors meeting agenda topics. The Public Comment link is available when a Meeting Agenda is posted; although comments may be submitted up until the meeting commences, to have them distributed for review prior to the meeting, comments must be posted one business day before the meeting start time.

To submit a Public Comment:

- Select a meeting from the links posted on the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors Public Meetings webpage.
- Once on the meeting agenda page, choose an agenda item.
- Add your comments for that agenda item.
- Comments will become public record.

Sample Public Comment Timetable

Every comment is sure to be different. This timetable is recommended as a guideline only.

Introduction and Set the Context 1 Minutes

State your name, role/title, organization and talk briefly about your personal commitment as member of the Steering Committee for the Reduction of African American Child Deaths in Sacramento County.

Express Support of the Strategic Plan 2 Minutes

Speak in support of the strategic plan, describing and emphasizing the intentionality of each strategies aimed at reducing the disproportional number of African American child deaths in Sacramento County, specifically within the targeted neighborhoods.

Be sure to wrap up with a brief recap and what action should be taken.
Presentation

Sacramento County’s IV-E Waiver

Sherri Heller, Director
Sacramento County Health & Human Services Department
Next Steps

- Incorporate Feedback into Strategic Plan Report
- Evaluation Work Group Meeting on January 27th
- Prepare for BOS presentation – April 7th
- Development of Implementation Plan
Contact Information

Robert Phillips
Sierra Health Foundation
rphillips@sierrahealth.org

Kindra Montgomery-Block
Sierra Health Foundation
kmontgomery-block@sierrahealth.org

Madeline Sabatoni
Sierra Health Foundation
msabatoni@sierrahealth.org
Title IV-E
Waiver Demonstration

Department of Health and Human Services
&
Department of Probation

Presented to
Steering Committee for Reduction in African-American Child Deaths
January 21, 2015
Objective

To test child welfare interventions designed to decrease reliance on foster care and shorten the time children have open welfare cases.

Goals

- Improve permanency and well-being outcomes
- Increase child safety without over reliance in out-of-home care
- Improve service array
- Engage families through individualized case work
Participating Counties

Cohort 1
7/1/07 – 9/30/19
- Alameda
- Los Angeles

Cohort 2
10/1/14 – 9/30/19
- Butte
- Lake
  - San Diego
  - San Francisco
  - Santa Clara
  - Sonoma
  - Sacramento
How Does It Work?

- Flexible use of federal foster care funding
- Must include child welfare and probation – DHA in Sacramento County
- Capped funding allocation based on 5-year average (2008–2012)
- Requires maintenance of base spending level
Counties must implement prevention and family centered practices.

Requires reinvestment of savings into child welfare and probation activities.

The evaluation component will include process, outcomes and costs.

Counties may opt out with fiscal repercussions.
Estimated Full Year Budget Comparison

- **Federal Funds**
  - No Waiver: $49.5 M
  - Waiver: $66.3 M

- **Local Share**
  - No Waiver: $107.1 M
  - Waiver: $107.1 M

**Total: $156.6 million**

**Total with Waiver: $173.4 million**
How Are Savings Generated?

Increased Budget

Additional federal funds (waiver) + Base amount (five-year average) + Unchanged local spending = Increased Investment in Better Outcomes

Lower Expenditures

Increased Investment in Better Outcomes - Decreased number of children in out-of-home care - Reduced entries and re-entries = SAVINGS

January 21, 2015
Potential Benefits to Sacramento County

Increased federal funding

- $12.3 million in flexible federal funding for FY 14/15
- Annualized $16.7 million through FY 18/19 (plus inflator)

Use of flexible dollars and reinvestment of future savings into programs...

- Prevention
- Wrap-around
- Intensive family reunification
- Evidence-based programs

...for better outcomes

- Increased reunification for CPS children
- More timely permanency for foster children
- Reduced re-entries into CPS
- Reduced recidivism for Probation children
- Reduced entry into systems due to effective prevention
What is the Risk?

If total costs in a given year exceed the level of additional funding, the County will be required to absorb those excess costs with local funding.
Variables Affecting Level of County Risk

- Caseloads
- Placement Costs
- Operation/Admin Costs

Realignment Growth
### Preliminary Plan for Use of IV-E Waiver (Full Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Positions (FTEs)</th>
<th>Full Year Staff Costs*</th>
<th>Contracts*</th>
<th>Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DHHS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$2.6</td>
<td>$7.5</td>
<td>$10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid Payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*millions
Other Considerations

Mitigating risk

• Funds set aside to cover unforeseen cost increases

Early opt out costs

• County would have to pay back all waiver money spent on services that are not Title IV-E eligible under traditional funding structure

Sustainability

• How would County fund waiver-related programs after the waiver period (FY19–20)?
Planned Interventions

**Safety**
- Safety Organized Practice (SOP)

**Prevention**
- Focus on children 6 and older

**Permanency**
- Intensive Family Finding and Kinship Support
Building Capacity

Providers
- Contracting for permanency and prevention services
- $1.1 million for FY 14–15
- $36 million over 5 years

Staff
- Partnering with providers to achieve outcomes
- Support local and state evaluation efforts
- Support policy development and training
- Ensure compliance with CWS/CMS requirements
Monitoring is Key

If chosen interventions do not lead to expected outcome improvements then we will not continue investing in them
Projected Caseload Reductions

- **Year 1** – Stable
- **Year 2** – 5% (ages 0–18)
- **Year 3** – 4% (ages 0–18)
- **Year 4** – 2% (ages 0–18)
- **Year 5** – 2% (ages 0–18)
Possible Risks

Sacramento In Care – Ages 0 – 17 Child Welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul-07</th>
<th>Jul-08</th>
<th>Jul-09</th>
<th>Jul-10</th>
<th>Jul-11</th>
<th>Jul-12</th>
<th>Jul-13</th>
<th>Jul-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4142</td>
<td>3880</td>
<td>3877</td>
<td>3191</td>
<td>2701</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td>2214</td>
<td>2471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possible Risks

Sacramento Children Entering Care Age 0–17
Child Welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JUL 05 – JUN 06</th>
<th>JUL 06 – JUN 07</th>
<th>JUL 07 – JUN 08</th>
<th>JUL 08 – JUN 09</th>
<th>JUL 09 – JUN 10</th>
<th>JUL 10 – JUN 11</th>
<th>JUL 11 – JUN 12</th>
<th>JUL 12 – JUN 13</th>
<th>JUL 13 – JUN 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>2,642</td>
<td>2,367</td>
<td>2,011</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>1,781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Achieving Better Outcomes

| Decreased Entries | Reduced Recidivism | Prevent Delinquency |
Planned Interventions

Entries
- Wraparound Services (WRAP)

Recidivism
- MultiSystemic Therapy (MST)

Prevention
- Functional Family Therapy (FFT)
Building Capacity

Providers
- $11.7 million over five years

Staff
- Assist with outcome, audit and service delivery
- Cross-over youth practice model and other cross-systems initiatives
- Case management and supervision
Projected Caseload Reductions

25% reduction

Decreased time in out-of-home placement
QUESTIONS