1. **Welcome and Introduction**
   - Supervisor Greg Cox brought the meeting to order at 2:05 pm, and asked the Advisory Board members to provide a brief introduction.
   - After introductions, Supervisor Cox and Supervisor Fletcher provided a brief history as to why the Advisory Board was formed and discussed their commitment to continuous improvement in all children and youth serving systems in San Diego. They also noted the need to be data driven and best practice informed. They also explained to the members that this Advisory Board will be replacing the Child Abuse Prevention Coordinating Council (CAPCC).
   - Supervisor Cox and Supervisor Fletcher discussed the need for the Advisory Board to look broadly and have a larger impact beyond Child Welfare and beyond San Diego.
   - Board members discussed their interest in improving systems of care for children, youth and families and scope of recommendations in the recent report- *Recommendations for Improving County of San Diego Child Welfare Services*.
   - Sandra McBrayer briefed the Advisory Board members on the contents of their new Advisory Board binders.
   - Members were informed that due to renovations at the County Administration Center future meetings may be held at the County Operations buildings.

2. **Discussion of Priority Issue Areas and Data Needs**
   - Sandra McBrayer discussed several strategies for moving forward and tackling the recommendations in the *Recommendations for Improving County of San Diego Child Welfare Services* report.
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- Sandra McBrayer discussed the need to develop systems for implementing and completing recommendations, including developing metrics for each recommendation and a tracking system for outcome completion.
- Sandra McBrayer discussed with the Advisory Board the idea of grouping the recommendations into three focus areas (Operational and Organizational Structure, Workforce and Child and Family Services) and forming ad hoc work groups to focus on the three areas.
- The Advisory Board discussed that not all recommendations will fit in these areas of focus, but felt this structure would capture most recommendations and be a good starting point.
- The Advisory Board discussed forming ad hoc work groups to begin addressing recommendations from the *Recommendations for Improving County of San Diego Child Welfare Services* report.
- The Advisory Board discussed including community subject matter experts to serve on the ad hoc work groups as well as staff from child welfare. Members stress the importance of including those with lived experiences serving on the ad hoc work groups.
- Supervisor Fletcher discussed the need to ensure that the Advisory Board understands what is in the law? What is County policy? What is in actual day to day practice? The Advisory Board discussed how the law, policy, and practice must all work together to best serve the youth and families.
- Sandra McBrayer provided a potential data dashboard list and asked the members to review and provide ideas and feedback.
- The Advisory Board provided additional data suggestions and feedback on the data provided, as well as what else the Advisory Board would like to see included in data collection. See Attachment 1 for proposed data elements.
- Members discussed mechanisms to add or subtract items in the ad hoc work groups and how recommendations are addressed, tracked, and measured for success.
- The Advisory Board discussed the potential need to add additional recommendations to the work groups from other child and youth serving systems.
- Members discussed communicating with each other concerning data elements and Kyle Sand from County Counsel cautioned the members that this body was appointed by the Board of Supervisors and is subject to the Brown Act and must follow communication protocols.
- Kyle Sand discussed that the best way to move forward was for all members to communicate directly through Sandra McBrayer and not to email the entire or part of the Advisory Board.
- It was discussed that Sandra McBrayer would collect all of member suggestions around data and she will work with Kimberly Giardina and Child Welfare to look at what data are available and what data development is needed. Kim and Sandra will provide update at the next meeting to see what is most important. They members discussed that data elements may change as the ad hoc work groups begin their work and look deeper into the recommendations.
- Kyle Sand discussed the makeup of the ad hoc work groups. He shared with the Advisory Board that the number of Advisory Board members on a work group has to be less than a quorum of the Board. He noted that the ad hoc work groups since they are time limited did not fall under the Brown Act.
- Advisory Board member will select which work group that would like to serve on and send that selection to Sandra McBrayer by June 28th 2019.
- The Advisory Board approved by consensus the focus areas and first three ad hoc work groups- Operational and Organizational Structure, Workforce and Child and Family Services.
3. Approval of By-laws
   • Kyle Sand presented the draft by-laws to the Advisory Board. He mentioned that the by-laws were drafted from Board Policy A-74 and Ordinance number 10598. The Advisory Board discussed meeting attendance, potential additional membership, the unneeded Secretary role, conflict of interest, ethics training, and term limits. Kyle Sand noted that several of these issues would require going back to the Board of Supervisors to change Ordinance number 10598.
   • Supervisor Fletcher motioned to adopt the by-laws, Jeff Weimann seconded, with all members voting in favor.

4. Public Comment
   • Melissa Brooks from YMCA Kinship Support suggested looking at supervision and quality of supervision as well as adoption and guardianship.

5. Adjournment
   • Future Agenda Items:
      o Supervisor Fletcher noted topics to be covered in the next meeting. Topics noted were:
         ▪ Training discussion from Probation and CWS.
         ▪ Presentation on the current County Child Services landscapes.
         ▪ Child Welfare update on current efforts on recommendations
         ▪ Ad Hoc Work Group updates.
         ▪ Data updates.
   • Supervisor Cox noted the next meeting will be held at 5500 Overland Ave. Room 120. He also announced at 5:00 pm this evening is the 2019 high school graduation celebration for San Diego County Foster Youth. The Meeting was adjourned at 3:46 pm.

   • Next Meeting: August 9th, 2019

Distributed:
   • Meeting Agenda
   • Potential Data Dashboards
   • Key Recommendations
   • Advisory Board By-Laws
   • Recommendations for Improving County of San Diego Child Welfare Services Report
   • Response to the Child Welfare Services Review Working Group
   • Board Policy A-74
   • Ordinance number 10598
   • Memorandum of Law

Meeting minutes were submitted by Sarah Williams. Please call her at (858) 581-5880 if you have corrections or suggested revisions. She may also be contacted for agenda items or general information. Thank you.
Child and Family Strengthening Advisory Board
Summary of Subcommittee Meetings

Subcommittees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcommittees</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>9:00-10:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and Family Services</td>
<td>11:00-12:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>1:30-3:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: Thursday, August 22, 2019
Location: County Operations Center, 5530 Overland Avenue, First Floor - Room 124
San Diego, California 92123
Facilitators: Sandra McBrayer, Sarah Rafi
Meeting Staff: Rachel Weber

Workforce Development Subcommittee Summary:

More than 25 attendees took part in the first Workforce Development Subcommittee. Sandra opened the meeting with background from the Child Welfare Work Group, the formation of the Child and Family Strengthening Advisory Board, and the purpose and roles of each of the three new subcommittees. Sarah facilitated a discussion on agreements for interaction and communication for the committee structure. Members introduced themselves and shared why this committee and the work with child welfare is important to them. Sandra and Sarah worked with the committee to begin a discussion on what recommendations pertained to this committee, if the recommendations were in alignment with this committee and to ensure there is common understanding of the recommendations. During the meeting members discussed demographics of Child Welfare Services (CWS) staff and spoke of the need to ensure diversity in CWS staff to reflect the communities they work in. Members spoke about wanting to understand the skill level of staff, their education, and training and how skills are measured. The subcommittee also discussed the training CWS staff receive, how it is developed, frequency, and how it is evaluated. Participants addressed the need for cultural competency/implicit bias training and positive parental engagement training. Members discussed multi-variant trainings and the need for understanding how continued assessment is conducted. The committee also discussed the potential need for additional clinical support for CWS staff and wanted to learn more about the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) program including Child Welfare staff utilization and satisfaction.

The group provided several recommendations:

- Revise Recommendation #5 to include “Resource Families”
- Change the word “Training” in all recommendations to “Learning”
• Change the phrase “CWS Staff” in all recommendations to “Those working in the field”

Child and Family Services Subcommittee Summary:

More than 60 attendees took part in the first Child and Family Services Subcommittee. Sandra opened the meeting with background from the Child Welfare Work Group, the formation of the Child and Family Strengthening Advisory Board, and the purpose and roles of each of the three new subcommittees. Sarah facilitated a discussion on agreements for interaction and communication for the committee structure. Members introduced themselves and shared why this committee and the work with child welfare is important to them. Sandra and Sarah worked with the committee to begin a discussion on what recommendations pertained to this committee, if the recommendations were in alignment with this committee and to ensure there is common understanding of the recommendations. The subcommittee spent considerable time with the first recommendation “A Child’s right to be present at court proceedings” and had many questions and concerns regarding it. Members discussed the importance of child and youth attending their own court proceedings and that they need to be prepared mentally and physically (appearance, clothing), for court. Members engaged in conversations concerning current practices and policies for CWS staff in supporting children and youth in attending their hearings and being better prepared. The committee brainstormed around best practices and what other counties and states do in facilitating the attendance and active participation of children and youth in their court proceedings. Members discussed judges conducting one-on-one’s with children and youth to improve communication and understanding of court processes. Other suggestions and comments provided on Recommendation #1 included:

• Make court appearances more meaningful by fully involving and preparing children and youth.
• Explore County partnership for private transportation to assist in children and youth in attending their court proceedings.
• Explore if youth have input on court scheduling. Encourage flexibility in court scheduling.
• Explore ways children and youth can be better prepared for their court proceedings. Examples include: touring a courtroom when not in use, having one-on-one meetings with the Judge and writing letters of their thoughts, concerns, and desires in preparation of their court proceedings.
• Allow the child and youth to define which adult(s) would support and accompany them to court proceedings.

Members also commented that sharing family/case histories and cross communication with those working in the field could improve outcomes and foster better relationships. Members were interested in confirming if it is possible to submit forms electronically in reference to California Rule of Court, Rule 5.534(c). Lastly, the committee was interested in learning if transportation is currently being provided to children and youth to attend their own court proceedings and if so, how is transportation arranged? All members agreed that transportation provided should be private (not public or shared transportation).
Organizational Structure Subcommittee Summary:

More than 25 attendees took part in the first Organizational Structure Subcommittee. Sandra opened the meeting with background from the Child Welfare Work Group, the formation of the Child and Family Strengthening Advisory Board, and the purpose and roles of each of the three new subcommittees. Sarah facilitated a discussion on agreements for interaction and communication for the committee structure. Members introduced themselves and shared why this committee and the work with Child welfare is important to them. Sandra and Sarah worked with the committee to begin a discussion on what recommendations pertained to this committee, if the recommendations were in alignment with this committee and to ensure there is common understanding of the recommendations. The subcommittee had several questions and concerns regarding the first recommendation “Transformative and Transparent Change among leaders.” Members wanted clarification regarding the definition of the word, “leaders.” The committee discussed that “leaders” should represent those internally and externally, at all levels, throughout the CWS organization. Others also commented that “diverse” should be added to the recommendation to further define leaders.

The committee discussed the importance of meeting the diverse cultural needs of distinct populations within our county. Members discussed how cultural competency of those working in the field can translate to more beneficial interactions and more positive outcomes. In addition, members agreed that dimensions of diversity need to be further defined.

The committee suggested further defining and clarifying Recommendations #2 “Create an implementation exam to expand and evaluate Safety Enhanced Together (SET) efforts” and Recommendation #3 “Actively involve stakeholder in establishing forward looking core values, adding foundation established by SET, to provide consistent decision points for leadership and staff strategy, prioritization, execution and personnel practices” and requested that a detailed presentation be developed to educate members about SET, including its history, current efforts and outcomes.

Members recommended revising the language in Recommendation #4 “Create a public recognition for staff at all levels whose work personifies these values” to better define the word “values,” to “forward looking core values.” In addition, members discussed the recommendation as to the need to create public recognition for CWS staff. Following a lengthy conversation members were split on the relevance of doing this. Some questioned the need and value, while others agreed with the importance of recognition at all levels. Several members wanted to learn more about what the public recognition will entail.

Members also discussed Recommendation #5 “Identify leaders with a clear willingness to examine their organization with honesty and transparency” and recommended revising the language to better define the word “leaders,” to “leaders at all levels.” In addition, the committee recommended revising this recommendation to include “promoting” leaders: “Identify and promote leaders with a clear willingness to examine their organization with honesty and transparency.” Members also wanted clarification on what “willingness” means and how it is measured.
### HOTLINE - Monthly Averages - FY2018/19

#### Child Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 Years</td>
<td>1,978 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>1,946 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14 Years</td>
<td>1,618 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 and Up</td>
<td>1,092 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ethnic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3,056 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,752 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>800 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>738 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>221 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>67 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gender

- Male: 3,254 (49%)
- Female: 3,363 (51%)
- Unknown: 16 (0%)

#### Referral Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allegation Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Neglect</td>
<td>1,555 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Abuse</td>
<td>1,183 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td>1,151 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Risk, Sibling Abused</td>
<td>825 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>688 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Neglect</td>
<td>83 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker Abs/Incap</td>
<td>52 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation</td>
<td>14 (.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes referrals that were evaluated out.

#### Investigation Decision

- Investigate: 1,925 (53%)
- Evaluate Out: 1,723 (47%)

#### Investigation Decisions by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>365 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Inland</td>
<td>354 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>327 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>318 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coastal</td>
<td>257 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>219 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>32 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med/Deaf Services</td>
<td>28 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Specialty Unit</td>
<td>17 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>9 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adoptions, Extended Foster Care, Hotline, Residential, and San Pasqual Academy

CWS Data Unit: 9/11/2019
NEW CASES Opened in FY2018/19

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

**Age**
- 0 to 5: 900 (59%)
- 6 to 10: 326 (21%)
- 11 to 14: 196 (13%)
- 15 to 17: 108 (7%)
- 18 and older: 1 (0%)

**Gender**
- Female: 771 (50%)
- Male: 759 (50%)
- Unknown: 1 (0%)

**Ethnic Groups**
- Hispanic: 798 (52%)
- White: 413 (27%)
- Black: 212 (14%)
- Asian/P.I.: 65 (4%)
- Native American: 28 (2%)
- Other: 15 (1%)

**Initial Court Status**
- Court: 1038 (68%)
- Not Yet Determined: 9 (1%)
- Voluntary Guardianship: 448 (29%)
- Non-Dependent Legal Guardianship: 36 (2%)

**Current Assigned Region**
- Central: 339 (22%)
- East: 274 (17%)
- South: 255 (17%)
- North Inland: 225 (15%)
- Adoptions: 107 (7%)
- North Coastal: 105 (7%)
- North Central: 100 (7%)
- Med/Frag: 39 (3%)
- ISU: 31 (2%)
- Residential: 25 (2%)
- SPA: 17 (1%)
- EFC UNIT: 14 (1%)

**Initial Service Component**
- Family Reunification: 822 (54%)
- Family Maintenance: 594 (39%)
- Permanent Placement: 105 (7%)
- Emergency Response: 10 (1%)

**794,348** Child Population of San Diego County (0-17)

AGENDA ITEM #5

CWS Data Unit: 9/11/2019
**CASES OPEN EACH MONTH - FY2018/19**

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

**AGE**
- 0 to 5: 1,396 (48%)
- 6 to 10: 641 (22%)
- 11 to 14: 474 (16%)
- 15 to 17: 368 (13%)

**ETHNIC GROUPS**
- Hispanic: 1,460 (51%)
- White: 763 (26%)
- Black: 483 (17%)
- Asian/P.I.: 89 (3%)
- Native American: 66 (2%)
- Other: 18 (1%)

**GENDER**
- Male: 1,462 (49%)
- Female: 1,402 (49%)
- Unknown: 11 (0%)

**COURT STATUS**
- Court Ordered: 2,195 (76%)
- Pending: 73 (3%)
- Voluntary: 327 (11%)
- Non-Dependent Legal Guardianship: 283 (10%)

**REGION**
- South: 456 (16%)
- Central: 442 (15%)
- East: 385 (13%)
- North Inland: 264 (9%)
- North Coastal: 135 (5%)
- North Central: 121 (4%)
- Residential...: 100 (3%)
- San Pasqual...: 72 (3%)
- Med/Deaf...: 69 (2%)
- Extended Foster...: 68 (2%)
- Indian Specialty...: 51 (2%)
- Care: 1 (0%)

**SERVICE COMPONENT**
- Permanent Placement: 1,256 (44%)
- Family Reunification: 830 (29%)
- Family Maintenance: 716 (25%)
- Emergency Response: 76 (3%)
- Supportive Transition: 1 (0%)

**AGENDA ITEM #5**

**3,218** Average Number of Open Cases Each Month

**794,348** Child Population of San Diego County (0-17)

CWS Data Unit: 9/11/2019
### DEMOGRAPHICS

#### AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 17</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ETHNIC GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/P.I.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GENDER

- Female: 951 (49%)
- Male: 1,002 (51%)

#### REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoptions</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Inland</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coastal</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Services</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pasqual Academy</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med/Deaf Services</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Foster Care</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Specialty Unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways to Well-Being</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLACEMENT TYPE ON JULY 1, 2019

- Non-relative Resource Family...: 669 (34%)
- Kin*: 671 (34%)
- Guardian and Court Specified...: 237 (12%)
- FFA: 174 (9%)
- Group Home: 79 (4%)
- San Pasqual Academy: 71 (4%)
- Temporary Shelter Care Facility: 50 (3%)
- Pre-Adoption: 42 (2%)
- Trial Home Visit: 16 (1%)

*C includes relative homes and Resource Family Homes where the substitute care provider is

CWS Data Unit: 9/11/2019
**DEMOGRAPHICS**

**ETHNIC GROUPS**
- Hispanic: 169 (50%)
- Black: 86 (25%)
- White: 66 (19%)
- Native American: 9 (3%)
- Asian/P.I.: 9 (3%)
- Other: 2 (0%)

**GENDER**
- Female: 182 (53%)
- Male: 158 (46%)
- Unknown: 1 (0%)

**COURT STATUS**
- Court Ordered: 312 (92%)
- Voluntary: 26 (8%)
- Pending: 2 (0%)

**REGION**
- Extended Foster Care: 290 (85%)
- San Pasqual Academy: 30 (9%)
- Regional Office: 20 (6%)

**SERVICE COMPONENT**
- Supportive Transition: 327 (96%)
- Permanent Placement: 10 (3%)
- Family Maintenance: 2 (0%)
- Family Reunification: 2 (0%)

**PLACEMENT TYPE ON JULY 1, 2019 (n=315)**
- FFA: 133 (42%)
- SILP: 113 (36%)
- Guardian and Court...: 18 (6%)
- Group Home: 15 (5%)
- Resource Family Home: 6 (2%)
- Kin: 6 (2%)
- Pre-Adoption: 1 (0%)
- No Open Placement: 23 (7%)

*Please note: these numbers are from 7/1/2019 while the other numbers are monthly averages.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homes with Placements</th>
<th>Home Facility Type</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Type of Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>813</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>East South Central North Inland North Coastal North Central Out of County</td>
<td>Open Limited FC (Agency) FC Priority Placement Options Program Medically Fragile Limited FC (No Agency) Other*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 1502</td>
<td>Total: 1502</td>
<td>Total: 1502</td>
<td>Total: 1502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foster Home Pending and Approved Adoption Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Accepted Age Range* (by Availability)</th>
<th>Available Beds by Capacity</th>
<th>Homes on Hold*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 18 yrs</td>
<td>1352 Total</td>
<td>Voluntary 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 17 yrs</td>
<td>1189 Available Beds</td>
<td>Training 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 18 yrs</td>
<td>584 Available Homes</td>
<td>Complaint 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 17 yrs</td>
<td>219 Unavailable Beds</td>
<td>Administrative 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 2 yrs</td>
<td>86 Available Homes</td>
<td>Total: 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>28 Unavailable Beds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Foster Home Pending and Approved Adoption Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Accepted Age Range4</th>
<th>Homes with Available Bed(s)</th>
<th>Type of Home (by Availability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 18 yrs</td>
<td>260 Available Homes</td>
<td>Open 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 17 yrs</td>
<td>468 Available Homes</td>
<td>Limited FC (Agency) 54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 18 yrs</td>
<td>155 Available Homes</td>
<td>FC Priority Placement 54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 17 yrs</td>
<td>170 Available Homes</td>
<td>Options Program 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 2 yrs</td>
<td>393 Available Homes</td>
<td>Medically Fragile 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>468 Unavailable Homes</td>
<td>Other* 33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Available beds: 584
Unavailable beds: 393

*Foster Home Pending and Approved Adoption Home

- Includes Licensed Foster & Resource Family Homes only
- TBD
- Daily vacancy average for all regions by month
- Other* category represents all other accepted age ranges combined
- Holds at month-end
FAIRNESS AND EQUITY SUBCOMMITTEE

The multi-agency subcommittee was formed in January 2005 under Commission on Children, Youth and Families. In 2015, the subcommittee then serving under the Child Abuse Prevention Coordinating Council (CAPCC), subsequently engaged with a broad group of stakeholders to review current research, promising practices, and develop an Action Plan for addressing disproportionality and disparate outcomes for Native American and African American families the Child Welfare system from prevention to aftercare. The Fairness and Equity Committee was open to all member of the CAPCC and initially convened once a month then moved on a quarterly meeting schedule as items in the work plan were completed, including the development of the Cultural Responsiveness Academy for Child Welfare Services. The Fairness and Equity Committee stopped convening in 2017.

STARS AWARDS

The STARS Awards is an annual countywide recognition event in April coinciding with child abuse prevention month honoring STARS in the community. The STAR qualities are Support children and parents in your community, Take a positive perspective, Address the issues, Recognize that parenting can be challenging and offer support and Strengthen communities. The event hosts approximately 100-125 attendees inclusive of the CAPCC Board and members, CWS staff and community partners. Funded by CAPCC and the cost varied depending on the venue, programming, selection of food and beverages, awards, inclusion of paid speakers, and event planning contracts.

PARENTING EXPO

The Parenting Expo is an annual free event that encourages and facilitates community support to prevent and address child maltreatment and strengthen all families to Live Well. The Expo provides parents and caregivers with new tools and resources on parent education about healthy, safe and thriving children and families. The event consists of workshops, demonstrations, resource tables, exhibits, keynote speakers, and panel discussions. The day event provided breakfast, lunch, and free childcare to about 300 attendees annually. This event could be combined with other events that are hosted throughout the County such as Grandparents Raising Grandchildren and the Live Well San Diego Advance.

CAPCC FUNDING SUMMARY

The AB 2994 Children’s Trust Fund (CTF) consists of funding from birth certificate receipts, license plate fees, child maltreatment court restitution fines, Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention funds and grants, gifts or bequests from private sources. The approved CTF Funding for Fiscal Year 2018-19 is $2,050,000.

- **Child Abuse Prevention Coordinating Council:** $400,000
  - $200k to carry out the duties and responsibilities of the CAPCC as outlined in Admin Code 84.98.
  - $200k for continued funding of contracted services with iHeartMedia for commercials, news alerts, public service announcements, and social media posts.
- **Community Services for Families (CSF):** $800,000
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- CSF contracted providers provide community-based child maltreatment prevention and intervention services to children and families.
  - **Voluntary Guardianship Services and Special Education Legal Advocacy:** $550,000
    - Contract with nonprofit providers for the provision of legal guardianship and caregiver representation in special education matters.
  - **Community and Caregiver Support:** $300,000
    - Contracts for Kinship Support to provide primary and secondary prevention services such as the Grandparents Raising Grandchildren initiative and other kinship caregiver programs and activities.

SAN DIEGO PREVENTION PROJECT

The Prevention Cabinet of the County Welfare Directors Association of California, the California Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP), and Strategies 2.0 co-hosted a Prevention Summit in 1/2019. The purpose of the summit was to identify counties interested in taking more of a focus on child abuse prevention and develop specific projects in those counties. San Diego was one of 22 counties selected to participate. This summit resulted in the creation of San Diego’s Pursuit of Happiness Team and its vision is to Build the capacity of providers and caregivers to strengthen the social and emotional well-being of children 0-5 in order to support their engagement in and ongoing success in formal and informal early care and education settings.

OCAP has developed a structure for the prevention projects that requires each county’s child abuse prevention council to oversee the project, with project co-chairs being the Child Welfare Director and an appointee from the child abuse prevention council. Meredith Riffel has served as the co-chair of the project, along with the Child Welfare Director. Originally the project team consisted of 10 members representing Child Welfare Services, Behavioral Health Services, Eligibility Operations, Public Health Services, First 5 Commission of San Diego, San Diego County Office of Education, Casey Family Programs, YMCA Child Care Resources, Children’s Legal Services of San Diego, and the CAPCC. The team meets monthly and has expanded to include additional partners who work in the early childcare sector. The Pursuit of Happiness team continues to outline specific strategies to achieve its vision, such as asset mapping of early childcare providers in San Diego County.