

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**Iowa Differential Response Work Group**  
**May 9, 2012**

**Location:** United Way of Central Iowa, 1111 9<sup>th</sup> 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, Steve Scott, Denise Moore, Dennis Smith, Kathy Thompson, Michele Tilotta, Barb Van Allen. **Absent:** Kristie Oliver, Julie Walton  
Facilitator – Caren Kaplan

**Pre-Meeting Meeting Handouts:** First Batch (April 16, 2012) - - Track Assignment by Presence of Imminent Danger; DR Organized CPS System - Flow Chart; Selecting a Pathway.

Second Batch (May 2, 2012) - - Workgroup Member Connections - Stakeholder and Entity - By Area; Workgroup Member Connections - Stakeholder and Entity - By Name; Community Care Success Stories; Research FAQ; Alternative Response Brochure for Families; and Youth Today - FINAL VERSION 9-30-10 AMENDED.

Third Batch (May 8, 2012) -- Meeting Three - Stakeholder Work Group - May 9.2012 (Power Point Presentation); Target Population Prioritization; and Decisions and Key Points for Consideration

**The meeting began at 10:00am.**

Welcome and Introductions

Lance Roordan, Social Worker II, Case Manager at Polk County and Practicum Student, joined the Work Group and members introduced themselves. Lance will be observing the process and discussion.

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the April 10, 2012 meeting were unanimously approved.

Circling back to April 10, 2012 Meeting

Community Care: A description of service provision, the types of families served and aggregate statistics were presented to Work Group Members by Lori Mozena. Families identify services they need and care workers strive to identify these services. Prior to Community Care, these

families were less likely to have received services. Families are served an average of four months. The number of referrals by county will be provided to the group.

### Revisiting the Tasks of the Work Group

#### Legislation

- Caren Kaplan reviewed Iowa House Bill 2226, Section 6: Child Abuse Reports – Differential Response Review that mandates *the Department of Human Services conduct a comprehensive review to determine whether to recommend the implementation of a differential response to child abuse reports when the initial report is received by the department pursuant to section 232.70.*

#### Decisions to be made by Work Group Members:

- Assuming there is a recommendation to pursue DR, what is the rationale and how does it complement assets of existing system?
- What are the proposed target populations to remain the “traditional” response (Assessment Plus); what are the proposed target populations to be assigned to Family Assessment Response (FAR) response?
- Develop draft flow chart of DR System with integration of existing processes and services.
- Is pilot/staged implementation or whole state implementation recommended? What specific issues should be considered?
- Is enabling legislation recommended? What specific elements should be addressed in enabling legislation?
- What about DHS staff training? What are the essential components for training? Who is to receive training? Are there specific issues everyone should be trained on for example, domestic violence, substance abuse, change process, etc.
- Identify desired outcomes and data that will be tracked (to present before the legislature).

The Work Group discussed the possibility of providing a “minority report” in the event that all group members are not in agreement.

A Work Group Member requested examples of Pathway Assignment Tools for the group’s review. Another member requested a document that describes the Iowa DR Work Group and defines Differential Response.

### Interface between DR Framework and IA Child Protection System

#### Flow Chart

A draft flow chart (see Slide 13 in attached power point) was provided along with details that amends the existing IA Child Protection System with the incorporation of a Family Assessment Response, that is, a Differential Response CPS System. The Work Group discussed their observations about the flowchart and direction was provided to make further amendments to reflect the group’s comments.

A comparison of the two responses, Assessment Plus and Family Assessment Response, was detailed (See Slide 14 in attached Power Point).

### Key Issues and Considerations in Selecting a Target Population

Using current categorization as a guidepost, response times, assigned by Intake, are

- One hour response: children are in imminent risk/immediate safety threat exists – denial of critical care; toddler left unsupervised
- Up to 24 hours – everything else
- 96= No access to child

### Target Population Prioritization

In preparation for group discussion on this subject, Work Group Members were asked to participate in individual exercise that requested, from their knowledge and experience, what categories and/or child/family characteristics *must* receive the traditional response/assessment plus? The individual exercise was followed by a report out by the members and discussions regarding the items they identified as ESSENTIAL Assessment Plus response (i.e., investigation). Examples of several categories of maltreatment identified are all sex abuse, physical abuse that results in injury requiring medical attention, all allegations involving out of home care, and presence of illegal drugs in the child's body.

The group agreed to several guideposts for decision-making. Pathway assignment decisions are:

- Based on the impact/potential impact(s) on the child's safety
- Based on imminent danger and high risk
- Not defined by substance, i.e., marijuana, cocaine, methamphetamine, but rather severity/impact of drug on child
- Determined by the vulnerability of the child.

After concluding the naming of the ESSENTIAL Assessment PLUS categories, individual Work Group members identified categories for consideration of the POSSIBLE Assessment Plus response (that is, either Assessment PLUS or FAR). Examples include denial of critical care, number of previous reports, failure to thrive and exposure to domestic violence.

Members named allegations primarily concerning family poverty issues and denial of critical (except for one hour categories) as most suitable for a family assessment response. Dialogue will continue in future meetings regarding "absolutes" for Assessment Plus category

Dialogue regarding Iowa's movement to Differential Response continued. Concerns and reasons to move forward into a Differential Response system were discussed.

Next Meeting: May 31, 2012

Adjourn: 3:35pm

Minutes respectfully submitted by Caren Kaplan, MSW