

King County Systems Integration Initiative
Resource Committee
July 26, 2005 Work Session Notes

In Attendance:

Pam Jones
Lois Nicholas
Kathleen Harvey
Mick Moore
Susan Waild
Charlotte Booth
Bruce Knutson
John George
John Tuell

With Susan Waild chairing and John facilitating, the group devoted most of its work session to reviewing progress and planning for implementation of action strategies identified for this group in the Strategic Plan.

Announcements and Updates

CA Community Meetings

Bruce mentioned that coming up this Thursday is a meeting called by Cheryl Stephani, Children's Administration Asst. Secretary.....to discuss a planned increased use of performance-based contracting and requirements that evidence-based services be utilized. This is one of three to be held in different parts of the state.

Cuts to CA Region IV (King County)

Bruce also indicated concern about the Region IV budget reductions for Children's Administration, involving 50 FTE's. There is no way to do this without having significant impacts. It was clarified that the reduction will be over time and through attrition. Rep. Ruth Kagi suggested documenting the impacts. The court is getting involved, and is concerned regarding the loss of services which will impact court decisions.

JRA Director

The search is on for a new director to replace Cheryl; Kathleen will keep us posted.

Reinvesting for Youth

RFP's went out recently; Jim will keep us informed.

FFT

Children's Administration, with its new contracts, is instituting a new way of making referrals, and instituting better monitoring at the casework level.

Action Strategy Review

Cross-System Training

The plan to orient the committee to Conversation Café mode of cross-system training for some part of the curriculum.....will hopefully happen in August, but there is concern that thus far CA is not represented in this. The decision was to postpone this if there are no CA people available.

On-line training: this method could be used for highlighting agreements or protocols (for example, on sharing of information). This needs to be coordinated with the information people.

The Legal committee is developing a field guide, along with a short MOU. The field guide can be the basis for the legal curriculum. Noella Rawlings would like some people from the Resource committee to help develop the field guide. Lois is hoping to have the curriculum for cross-system training developed by the end of the year. When it comes to doing the work, the authorities involved in the collaboration will need to sanction the involvement of their staff and sign off on the work.

Educational Engagement

This committee is ready to launch; just a matter of finding a time that works for the members selected.

The Governor has recently appointed an Education Task Force, which is to attend to the education of all children. We should link our effort with that, find out more about it, let that task force know what we are doing, and suggest Mick to be a member of that task force as well. A letter of introduction should come from the ESC or from Judge Clark, but first Mick will check it out and email us with his suggestion as to how it should go.

Cross-System Infrastructure Development

There should be one MOU; protocols can roll out from it.

Joint case staffings: some are going on now, we can develop over time staffing mechanisms for different populations if needed. This will certainly come up in the Educational task force as a solution and a mechanism for getting people on one page with each child. There might be two or three populations or decision points as which joint staffings will be appropriate.

Some of these things are already in place, but it would make sense to formalize them through protocols.

Assessments

John G. reviewed for the group the language of the strategic plan on this action strategy, thinking we hadn't adequately addressed it last work session. And also brought copies of the inventory of assessment instruments used by CA and Probation. Finding that JRA assessments are missing, it was agreed these should be added, in the same format.

A committee should be formed to examine these instruments and determine the top two or three most likely to be used for different populations. The requirements of multiple agencies are met by the components of these

instruments. It should be determined which elements apply to which target populations, and then the Data committee can set about designing ways to get the information from the assessments into the right places so they can be used well.

Susan suggested we focus on one population (at least to start), which could be kids in detention who can't go home.....and look at what assessment is done, which instruments are used, which elements are necessary for joint work.

We don't necessarily want to develop new tools; it might be a matter of enhancing each existing instrument to add a question which could be common to all assessments being used by the partners..

A new intake tool for FRS is being developed, Charlotte mentioned.

How does all this fit in with the planned KIDS interlink system? Which of the assessments actually get entered into a system now?

Assessments done by the court go into the statewide data system and would be available.

Family assessments are really the most important to be sure are included for joint access, according to Charlotte.

This is a big body of work to be undertaken by a committee.

Regarding Assessment committee membership: it should really be the experts from each of our systems who are most familiar with the tools. Names suggested:

Dean Braxton, Juvenile Drug Court manager.

Jim Vollendorf, who is implementing systems county-wide for Terry Mark.

Lee Selah (who is also familiar with the FRS tools)

Gloria Kessel

Susan Waild (including county risk assessment tools)

And some worker bees representing intake and various decision points at which assessment is done or needed. Susan will give some thought as to who to bring.

The group should meet monthly and move this along.

It was suggested that the population of concern for these assessments be dual system kids. Mick should be involved if the group runs across assessment that is relevant to education systems (which certainly should occur).

Eventually, the above may lead to the need for interagency teams to do joint assessment, or joint planning based upon common or shared assessment.

What are the pieces of assessment information that will be needed to inform joint planning teams? We might find that the tools we already have.....already give us what we need.

Maybe we need a case planning tool to link assessment to case plans which are responsive to identified needs.

The tasks for the committee:

Analyze the main tools we use.

Determine or suggest how they should be used and shared.

Determine which are accessible currently, and make it easier to access all relevant ones which kids are shared.

We want a result to be that the assessments drive people to talk to each other rather than just seeing the assessment.

Susan Waild will take the lead on getting this committee going, with the hope that it could convene in September.

Interlink KIDS System

John T. shared with the group the report from Interlink. Note to the Data group: We need to get JRA info into this system; it is currently not included. We were reminded that the shareable information grid included in the Interlink Report is a work in progress and will need further enhance before it can be said to be complete.

Blended Funding

For shared kids, where might we look for funding of necessary services? We should look at the ways services are accessed, and different models in use.....braided versus blended. The committee should look at all of these. The Blended Funding Project created a body of knowledge on how to blend funds legally, being true to the requirements of each source. In our context, we should look at blending for the purpose of implementing joint initiatives serving our target populations. We can look at:

- Truly blended
- One system allows entry into the services of another system. One distinction is whether each partner maintains control of funds vs. turning the funds over to a joint or neutral entity to manage. An example is FFT expansion with county funds and Reinvesting in Youth. It is 75% offenders, but 25% can now be Becca and dependent kids.
- The Children’s Mental Health Initiative (of DSHS).....together agreeing to use Evidence-Based Practices.....separate but blending and expanding the availability of services to new populations who need them. In this way, there is pooling of resources for sex offender treatment, FFT, and ART. This is a statewide initiative, but we could do it at the county level. Charlotte Booth will see about making arrangements for CMHI staff to present to this committee in August.

Family Engagement

Discussion was about setting up two “listening sessions” of 90 minutes each (October and November) for families to meet with the Resources Committee as part of our work session time.

Susan Waild will make contact with Karen Spoelman, who unfortunately did not get timely notice of today’s meeting, to discuss these plans and get her involvement.

Groups to involve:

United Voices (an initiative of Systems of Care).....Kathryn Follett.....may or may not be available (employment status may have changed).

Federation of Families (?)

Next Meeting

August 30, 2 pm to 4:30 pm.

