COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
Child and Family Strengthening Advisory Board

Summary of Subcommittee Meeting

Subcommittee Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child and Family Services</td>
<td>11:00 - 12:30 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: Thursday, August 25, 2022
Location: Virtual via Zoom
Facilitator: Sandra McBrayer
Meeting Staff: Emily Lay, Stephanie Heying

Child and Family Services Subcommittee Summary: 34 attendees took part in the Subcommittee. Advisory Members Participating: Adam Reed, Alethea Arguilez, Ana Espana, Carolyn Griesemer, Jeff Weimann, Sandra Mueller, Stephen Moore

I, II. Sandra McBrayer opened the meeting and provided a brief overview of the agenda. She explained how the meeting was being conducted via the Zoom platform and encouraged participation.

III. Fostering Academy Success in Education
Sandra introduced Tim Harris and Sarah Glass from the County of San Diego. Tim and Sarah then shared the below update:

- Fostering Academic Success in Education (FASE) aligns with the Child Welfare Service (CWS) Safety Enhanced Together (SET) framework, which aims to ensure every child grows up safe and nurtured.
  - SET has 6 core values:
    - Relationships with children, youth, and families
    - Shared responsibility with community partners
    - Collaborative partnerships with kinship and resource families
    - A strong working relationship with the legal system
    - Helping children and youth achieve their full potential and develop lifelong relationships
    - A workplace culture characterized by reflection, appreciation, and ongoing learning
  - FASE Background:
    - This is a 3-year pilot program entering its third year, beginning in August 2020.
    - The goal of FASE is to improve the educational outcomes of foster youth.
    - Dedicated educational social workers (EDSWs) provide wraparound educational support to youth, their families, and local school districts.
      - EDSWs use educational assessments, case planning tools, and Core team meetings to link youth to resources.
    - FASE’s intended outcomes include:
• Community partnership
• Academic success
• Educational case management

• Role of EDSWs:
  o Educational case management.
  o Connect youths to academic support services.
  o Develop Education Case Plan.
  o Facilitate monthly Core meetings.
  o Identify school-based activities and resources.
  o Make referrals to services.
  o Coordinate with local colleges for educational planning and educational opportunities
  o EDSWs collaborate with the youth, their biological family, and the resource home where
    the youth has been placed, schools, and CWS.

• FASE Outcomes:
  o 85% of students improved their grade point average (GPA).
    ▪ 35% of these students increased their GPA to 4.0
  o All seniors graduated.
  o 95% of seniors were enrolled in college classes.

• Questions and comments on the FASE presentation:
  o Sandra Mueller commented that the FASE program shows great potential, and she is
    thrilled to hear of the success stories during such a short pilot.
  o Sandra McBrayer asked if schools are selected based on the largest foster youth
    population. Laura Krzywicki responded that San Diego County Office of Education
    (SDCOE) and CWS work closely to determine which schools have the highest foster youth
    populations and coordinate with the school districts to implement the FASE program.
  o Sandra commented that comparing and cross-referencing suspension/expulsion data
    from schools with the schools foster youth population may shed light on which schools
    the program would work best in. A participant commented that the suspension/expulsion
    data is often not up to date and could make school selections more difficult.

IV. Practice Improvement Recommendation
Sandra opened the agenda item and passed it on to Tami Snyder from CWS. Tami then shared the below update:

• Open Case Investigations (OCI):
  o In 2017, California Department of Social Services (CDSS) stated investigating workers must
    not be the same social worker as the case-carrying worker.
  o In 2018, CWS recommended a separate unit to investigate allegations in open cases be
    developed.
  o The goal of OCI is to investigate whether or not abuse has occurred.
  o OCI unit began taking open case referrals in June 2020.
    ▪ The types of cases investigated include family maintenance, family reunification,
      referrals due to fatality of a child/youth, dual jurisdiction youth, and youth any
      type of permanent plan.

• Role of OCI Staff:
  o Collaborate with case carrying social workers and child/youth’s attorney.
  o Communicate with biological parents of allegations when child/youth is placed out of the
    home.
  o Host child and family team meetings and multidisciplinary team meetings.

• OCI partnerships and collaborations include:
  o Assigned principal social worker
• Institutions Evaluation Unit (IEU)
• Community Care Licensing
• RFA Investigating Unit/Complaint Specialists
• Law Enforcement
• Office of the Ombudsman

• OCI does not make decisions related to placement, visitation, services, case plan compliance, etc.
• Over 50% of referrals that come to OCI are unfounded.

Questions and comments on the OCI presentation:

• A participant asked if most substantiated referrals are non-FR cases.
• Jeff Wiemann commented that the military is a great partner when investigating abuse cases that may have occurred on a military base. He stated the collaborations the OCI unit does with IEU and Community Care Licensing have improved drastically and the increased communications have been a great help to agencies like Angels Foster Family Network.
• A participant asked if the OCI unit has experienced an increase in referrals due to the availability of the CWS Hotline for foster youth. Sandra asked if the referrals received by OCI are tracked by age. Tami responded she does not have exact data, but it could be developed. She stated OCI often sees referrals for children under the age of 5 and for teenagers with mental health issues, substance use issues, involvement in potential human trafficking issues, etc.
• Carolyn Griesemer commented that OCI has helped decrease the number of youth interviews and decrease the duplication of interviews.

V. Family’s First Update
Agenda item was moved to the October meeting due to the presenter having a last-minute conflict.

VI. Follow-up Information from Polinsky Children’s Center PowerPoint

• Sandra opened the agenda item and passed it on to Balambal Bharti from CWS. Balambal then shared the below update:

Resource Family vs. Resource Home

• Resource Family and Resource Home are considered the same type of placement.
• The most common type of placement for youth leaving PCC is a Resource Family Home.

Breakdown of the 31% of children and youth with PCC stays longer than 10 days

• Race/Ethnicity: Primarily White, followed by Latino, African American, and Asian/Pacific Islander.
• Sex at Birth: Fairly equal, with 53% female and 47% male.
• Age at last placement: The majority were 15 years old, with an age range of 5-years to 17-years.
• Length of stay: Ranged from 13-74 days, with one youth staying at PCC for 225 days.

Questions and comments on the breakdown of the 31% of children and youth with PCC Stays longer than 10 days:

• Jeff Wiemann asked for clarification on whether the data provided shows youth who are placed in a Short-Term Residential Treatment Placement (STRTP) facility or in some other type of placement. He stated he was unsure whether STRTPs accepted children as young as 5. Balambal clarified that all the youth in the data were placed in an STRTP after staying at PCC. Valesha Bullock confirmed that one youth (age 5) was placed in a specialized facility, but she could not confirm that age limitations of other STRTPs.
• Jeff Wiemann asked for clarification on the timeframe of the data. Sandra stated the data represents January-December 2021. Jeff asked for more recent data from the start of 2022 for comparison.
• Stephen Moore asked for data that shows the length of stay at PCC longer than 10 days for youth that went to placements other than an STRTP.
Carolyn Griesemer asked what types of behavioral and educational health services are in place at PCC for youth who stay longer than 10 days. Sandra responded that several programs have been implemented at PCC: PCC staff have access to community assessment teams, Just in Time lived experience mentors, and Achievement Centers.

Sandra concluded the meeting by reviewing items that will be discussed during the October meeting.
- Family’s First Update
- Breakdown of total children and youth at PCC with stays longer than 10 days
- Data of total children and youth at PCC with stays longer than 10 days from January-June 2022 for comparison
- Educational and Mental Health services at PCC
- Length between arrival at PCC and assessment of children and youth by Qualified Individuals (QIs)
- Workgroup Recommendations

Sandra then reminded everyone of the upcoming full advisory board meeting occurring on Friday, September 9th at 9:00 am.

VII. Next Meeting: October 27, 2022, 11:00 am