

MEETING NOTES
Iowa Differential Response Work Group
May 31, 2012

Location: United Way of Central Iowa, 1111 9th Street, Suite 100, Rooms B/C, Des Moines, IA 50314

Members Present: Julie Allison; Gina Butteris, Kirsten Faisal, Lori Lipscomb, Mike McInroy, Dick Moore, Lori Mozena, Kristie Oliver, Steve Scott, Denise Moore, Dennis Smith, Kathy Thompson, Michele Tilotta, Barb Van Allen. Julie Walton

Observer: Lance Roordan, Social Worker II, Case Manager at Polk County & Practicum Student

Facilitator: Caren Kaplan [remote facilitation]

Guest: Wendy Rickman, Division Administrator, Iowa Department of Human Services

Pre-Meeting Meeting Handouts: May 31st Meeting Agenda; Notes from May 9th Meeting; Differential Response Definition and Work Group Description - One Pager; Sample Pathway Assignment Form; IA Differential Response Child Protective Services System Flowchart – AMENDED (based on changes made during May 9th DR Work Group Meeting); Workgroup Members' Connections -Stakeholder and Entity - By Name; Workgroup Members' Connections - Stakeholder and Entity - By Area; DR Talking Points – IA DHS; Target Population Prioritization (depicts May 9th meeting discussion and provides alignment with DHS categories); Communication Plan Worksheet (template); Communication Plan Worksheet (individualized for each Work Group member).

The meeting began at 1:00pm.

Welcome and Greetings from Wendy Rickman, DHS Division Administrator

Caren Kaplan was unable to be present and facilitated the meeting remotely. Julie Allison assisted with the facilitation function.

Wendy Rickman, Division Administrator introduced herself to the members and indicated her interest (1) in knowing the group's perspectives on how the process is progressing and (2) to share information from the Department's vantage. She indicated that from the DHS perspective "whether" to implement DRS is not really a choice. The Group is to be the voice of HOW to move forward - - at a global level. The commitment from the DHS administration team is present and they are going to resource this work. Wendy explained that the Department is working on the budget development for FY '14 – '15 so future needs are being anticipated.

Wendy assured group that the first priority is child safety regardless of the pathway assignment. Safety and risk assessments will be conducted with all families. She stated that evaluative work across the country indicates the value of family engagement without the existence of a finding.

Mike McInroy and Wendy Rickman described their experience with pre-removal family conferences in Polk County. In three months, family conference participation went from almost no families to almost all families.

Wendy indicated that to her, with DRS, the biggest philosophical shift is changing our belief that the investigative process with a finding allows us to better protect kids. She stated that those who work in the field will shift what they think about families when they start engaging families and serving as the 'helpers' they always want to be.

A member noted that the Work Group had been talking about **if** we should do it but now, there was a need to focus on **HOW** we should do it. Wendy stated that intake protocols will need to be revisited but reminded the group that Iowa's intake used to be conducted 99 different ways and now has a centralized intake system.

She stated that it is very important to surface Work Group Members' concerns and include these issues in the final report. She expressed her desire not to underestimate families' willingness to engage with us; every time you knock on someone's door, they have a choice. Work Group members agreed to be spokesmen for this process.

Wendy expressed her openness to conversation with Work Group members about DR, the pilot selection criteria, and any other issues members wanted to dialogue with her about subsequent to the meeting. She turned the meeting over to Caren Kaplan.

Caren provided an opportunity for members of the Work Group to express their reactions to the information provided by and comments of Wendy Rickman. Several members expressed comfort and enthusiasm with the idea of a differential response system but had many questions about the details. Julie Allison assured Work Group Members that they would have a continuing role as the process moves forward; they would have future opportunities for input.

Approval of the Meeting Notes

The minutes of the May 9, 2012 meeting were unanimously approved.

Circling back to May 9, 2012 Meeting

- Community Care Data by County: Lori Mozena agreed to provide this data to Caren immediately after the meeting for dissemination to the membership.
- Pathway Assignment – Sample Form: At the May 9th meeting, a member requested the receipt of a sample tool used to make the determination of the assignment to the Assessment Plus Traditional pathway or the Family Assessment Response. An example of an Ohio tool was provided to the group and reviewed by Caren.
- Revisiting the Work Group's Decision to Recommend Differential Response in Iowa: After much discussion among the membership, Caren Kaplan asked the members to indicate by vote whether or not they recommend Iowa's implementation of a differential

response child protection system. The voting options were: “Yes”; “Yes with Qualifications” and “No”. Eight of the 15 members voted “Yes”; six members voted “Yes with Qualifications” and one member voted “No”.

All individuals who had a *qualified* recommendation were asked to articulate their qualifications in writing and send them to Caren via e-mail. This process was agreed to.

Julie Allison asked the members whether they believe in the *philosophy* of differential response – families involved in the child protection system are most likely to change when they are given the power/voice to control what they need and want to happen. Findings are not required in order for families to change and can get in the way of the family’s ability to change. All acknowledged that they believe in the philosophy of DR.

Two pieces of legislation that address requisites pertaining to differential response systems were discussed by Work Group members - - Iowa House Bill 2226 and federal legislation CAPTA Reauthorization of 2010. Caren agreed to provide all with CAPTA information.

- Iowa Differential Response Flow Chart – Caren and Julie described the changes that were made to the flow chart based on Work Group discussions and decisions. Julie emphasized that this flow chart is in an evolutionary process, subject to change, and is to be used for internal DHS purposes.

There was some discussion that as the DR System matures and there is increased experience with the approach and practice, there may be consideration of being able to switch families from an Assessment PLUS Response to a Family Assessment Response. The Work Group requested that this possibility be revisited in the future and this recommendation be reflected in the Final Report.

- Target Population Prioritization
A handout was provided to Work Group members in advance of the meeting that captured the categories that the membership detailed as **essential** for an Assessment Plus Response (that is, investigation response) and categories that the membership identified as **possible** for an Assessment Plus Response (that is, possibly suitable for either response). This handout aligned the categories named by the group with the maltreatment categorization as codified in Iowa rules and policies and enabled a crosswalk between the current Iowa maltreatment schema and the types of maltreatment proposed by the group as essential for Assessment Plus.

Caren checked in with the group to verify that the material adequately reflected their sentiments and asked for additional comments. Julie asked that the group identify 3 – 4 areas/categories to which they could agree.

Motion by Kirsten Faisal: All child abuse that currently falls within one hour response shall be considered essential for Assessment PLUS Response. *No second*. Further discussion:

The group discussed the use of the sample Ohio Pathway Assignment Tool to guide the Work Group's process that is, using a comparable format and structure to identify categories. The group discussed the advisability of linking the language currently used in Iowa CPS policy with the developmental differential response system. Julie Allison volunteered to bring the Guidance Tool and policy decisions related to one hour responses in order to review and determine alignment with the essential Assessment Plus response.

A question was raised regarding Illinois' categories of assignment to the state's FAR pathway. Caren agreed to provide information to the membership on this. The Work Group agreed that **all** sexual abuse allegations should receive an Assessment Plus response.

It was suggested that every Denial of Critical Care have the option to go through FAR pathway; discrete categories of Denial of Critical Care may respond favorably to an engagement approach. One-hour DCC's *may be* screened into Assessment Plus. It was suggested that consideration can be given to the number of previous reports as well as the vulnerability of the child.

Communication Plans: Talking about Differential Response

Caren reviewed the two handouts related to the connections that Work Group members had with stakeholders as well as the tools that provide the foundation of personalized communication plans with these stakeholders. Each member was provided the framework of a personalized Communication Plan and was asked to use the tools -- the Differential Response Definition and Workgroup Description -- one pager; the DR Talking Points; Power Point Slides #10 -- #16; and examples of communication vehicles, e.g., research FAQs, brochure and op ed article. Caren told the group that she would detail instructions regarding the requested task and should the 'ask' be unclear, members were encouraged to follow up with her.

Setting the Stage for the Next Two Meetings

June 15 Topics:

- a. Pilot of DRS in Iowa
- b. Data and Measures to be collected/non-negotiable
- c. Enabling Legislation

June 25 Topics:

- a. Training
- b. Outline of Final Report
- c. Next Steps

Next Meeting: June 15, 2012

Adjourn: 4:30pm

Minutes respectfully submitted by Caren Kaplan, MSW