

Federal Case Reviewers' Learning Collaborative - Notes

2600 Tenth Street, Berkeley – BAA Training Room

February 13, 2018 / 10am-3pm

Welcome, Introductions, Overview of the Day

State of the State (Karena Brown)

- PIP is close to being completed.
- 4-day training took place in Berkeley in January; ACF observed and had great feedback for California's Case Review program.
- New Manager in the Case Review department at CDSS; there will be reassignments for Case Consultants.
- Interviewing training on March 14 in Redding.
- CQI Conference at the end of March in Davis is full but if you want to attend, add yourself to the waitlist.

County Sharing

- Napa – nothing to share but looking forward to the Marin presentation as a way to improve trend sharing and because they aren't sharing information yet.
- San Mateo – item dilemma: Foster care case; during PUR the youth who is transgender started hormones. Question - how to answer the table in Item 17 to be supportive of the youth? Recommendation is to include the identified need as "transgender health treatment" and "hormone therapy" as the service provided.
- Marin – conceptualizing the difference between reasonable efforts and concerted efforts. It's been helpful to "dive deeper" and go beyond the snapshot of the PUR and stay curious.
- Alameda – question that has come up: How do you capture the interviewee's voice when you have to generalize the narrative – especially when it changes the weight of what's being shared? Recommendation is to be aware of how you're going to share the information if you're using quotes or direct narratives. Ultimately, if you have the evidence to support the quote, then let the evidence speak for itself and leave out the quote. There's a time and place for quotes – when it speaks volumes to the quality of the work.
- San Benito – question that has come up: Timely completion of reports is often delayed so ANI is often the response; response from county is that the Case Review team is judging too harshly. How do you get people to understand Case Review who don't? Recommendation: ask CDSS Consultant to run reports to compare San Benito's data to the state's data. Additionally, Karena Brown will connect with the CDSS Research Specialist who can pull data to support San Benito's question. Last, educating people who don't know about Case Reviews to learn more about them will help the cause.
- Solano – item dilemma/clarification: Ethical issue with CDSS/ACF's shift in the definition of well-being (when well-being needs are unmet – Case Reviewers

now need to clarify how these issues are being resolved). How to manage relationships with staff when cases are reviewed over and over again? This has been a practice issue that has been different; it's important to include this information when submitting the case to CDSS.

- Sonoma – something to share: Part of their Case Review process is sharing results with their Leadership on a quarterly basis; they always present 3-5 recommendations, which sometimes carry over. The Leadership team recently focused on “Case Planning” and Sonoma is making an effort to make improvements. One benefit is that the Case Review Manager is part of the Leadership team – so they aren't meeting and creating change in a vacuum.
- Santa Cruz – something to share: understanding and engagement with Case Reviews has increased in Santa Cruz because of the team's relationship building and education that they've focused on (ie: continuously showing up, joining steering committees, working toward collaboration, etc). It's starting to feel like the Case Review process (and outcomes) is getting easier – the time, energy and effort is paying off!
- Santa Clara – question that's come up: Lots of staffing changes in Santa Clara and a new person has stepped into the QA role (interim) – has CDSS updated the process for how QA can receive information? Response: email the CDSS Case Review inbox to name who the QA person is in Santa Clara.
- San Francisco – item dilemma: Achieving Permanency (Item 6) – received an error message back from OMS – wasn't able to answer 6C because the goal wasn't achieved. Recommendation: this is a nuanced example and there is some guidance in the tool and if the narrative has support, then whatever the identified permanency goal is needs to be justified within the narrative.

Networking Lunch

- Lunch provided by BAA
- Case Review contact list update

Ice Breaker (Maryanne Rehberg)

Marin: Case Review Findings and Recommendations (Maria Affinito)

Common Questions and Themes from the Case Review Inbox and good examples from QA (Karena Brown)

Closing and Next Steps

- Create agenda for next Learning Collaborative
- Next Learning Collaborative: 5/10/18 at the California Endowment (2000 Franklin Street, Oakland CA 94612)