

## **Federal Case Reviewers' Learning Collaborative**

2600 Tenth Street, Berkeley – BAA Training Room

November 14, 2017 / 10am-3pm

### **Notes**

#### **Welcome, Introductions, Overview of the Day**

- Counties present: Santa Clara, Napa, **San Mateo**, Alameda, **Contra Costa**, San Francisco, Monterey, Solano, Santa Cruz, Sonoma, CDSS
- Reminder: please register in advance as space is limited and lunch is ordered.
- Next Learning Collaboratives: 2/13/18 and 5/10/18
- 4-day Dates in Berkeley: January 23-26, 2018

#### **State of the State** (Karena Brown & Irene Serwanga)

- Heather Pankiw was promoted! Karena Brown is our new consultant who will be joining the Learning Collaboratives regularly.
- The CDSS Case Review team recently hired a new consultant. A new manager will likely be hired, as well as a new unit under the Case Review team. Each consultant currently carries 8-9 counties, but that will shrink due to the increase of a new unit.
- Delay in responding to Inquiries; CDSS is planning to train the entire unit so that there are more people who can respond to the Inquiries. PIP case Inquiries will be prioritized.
- If you've submitted an Inquiry for a PIP case and you haven't received a response, please connect with your CDSS consultant.
- No updates on the PIP – not yet approved. ACF will be coming out to support to help the process.

#### **County Sharing**

- Monterey – Item dilemma/question that's come up: how to document the rating for the Visitation question when a sister refuses to be placed with her brother. Others weighed in asking if the county made an effort to have the children visit. Rate to what the agency did to make the visits happen, as well as therapeutic intervention. Don't override the question about Visitation, but respond in the narrative re: concerted efforts.
- Santa Clara – Item dilemma/something to share: Certain items don't apply on a Voluntary Family Reunification case – Case Reviewer needed to review it as an out-of-home case rather than an in-home. Specific amount of time (24+ hours) and funding helped determine whether it was out-of-home. Required CDSS support. Did not qualify as an elimination case.
- Solano – Question that's come up: the team recently rated a maternal grandmother (legal guardian) and aunt (who target child was living with) both as mother for items 8, 11, 12, 13, etc. – not sure if this was the best idea?

Reviewer's thought was to rate more people and then remove later. CDSS does not have an answer but asked more questions. General thought was that inclusion is better.

- Alameda – Something to share/update: Time period that was “off” from Case Reviews was helpful as they did a content analysis on Laurel’s cases. Also, created a Peer Review Checklist. Laurel will send to Emily for distribution.
- Sonoma – Question that’s come up: because of the fires, they’ve needed to reorganize the structure of Case Reviews based on the needs of the community. When a natural disaster happens and it falls within a review period, it’s easy to plan – in reflecting, what does this mean for Case Review documentation? Not necessarily a question but more of a reflection point. Karena and Irene from CDSS will bring this question back to Julie Cockerton to address this with ACF on one of their calls. One suggestion is to include the answer regarding “out of agency’s control.”
  - Follow up question: what is the plan for county to county support in the next disaster? Lessons learned from Sonoma and Napa? Emily will follow up with County CWS Directors in the region.
- Napa – Something to share: Providing gift cards (\$10 Target) has been helpful in getting interviews with teenagers; they’re using county dollars.
- San Francisco – Question that’s come up: Indication on referral of who has allegations doesn’t dictate from Case Review who all the kids are that need to be interviewed for Case Review. Regardless of allegations, any kids that were part of same household as target child during PUR, would need to be considered for Case Review.
- Santa Cruz – Item dilemma/something to share: The team has been reviewing quite a few cases where they feel like cases aren’t being taken as seriously as they should be; reminder to all that this will continuously happen and there’s no way that we won’t leave a footprint – but how do we do it lightly. Even though they are “veteran” Reviewers, there is still an emotional impact. The team is continuously discussing these cases together to support each other.
  - Sonoma named that they have a weekly “debrief walk.”
  - Discussion about Advanced Interviewing class for Case Reviewers; BAA will plan training.
- Contra Costa – Something to share: When we see continuous issues, how do others partner with the agency and what’s the feedback loop? CCC identify themes – inclusive of ones that are working well and ones that aren’t – and then presenting at each of their district offices their findings.
- San Mateo – Something to share: Lots of staff turnover, which means the Case Reviewers are interviewing the Supervisor instead of the Worker. The Case Reviewers include “this is an area that needs improvement” in the narrative. One suggestion is to provide the information to leadership that staff turnover is a big issue and impacting Case Reviews.

## **Networking Lunch**

**Redacted Case with Item Specific Focus on #3, 8 and 12A (Irene Serwanga)**

**Closing and Next Steps**

- Create agenda for next Learning Collaborative