

**Federal Case Reviewers' Learning Collaborative**  
2000 Franklin Street, Oakland – California Endowment  
November 6, 2018 / 10am-3pm

**Notes**

**State of the State** (Karena Brown, Ram Ross)

- New CDSS consultant – Kiele Haw – Sonoma and Santa Clara have been assigned to her (so far).
- New procedure since October: CDSS Consultants are overseeing inquiries that come in from the counties they are assigned to; this process has allowed for a quicker turnaround. Continue to email the CDSS Case Review (cwscasereviews@dss.ca.gov) inbox and cc your County Consultant.
- PIP counties – PIP data was published on the CDSS website – 1) PIP cases that were reviewed and 2) all other cases from the PIP counties.
- There is a PIP! The PIP can be viewed from the CDSS website at: [http://www.cdss.ca.gov/Portals/9/CFS%20PIB/CA\\_PIP\\_9\\_26\\_18.pdf?ver=2018-09-26-142912-117](http://www.cdss.ca.gov/Portals/9/CFS%20PIB/CA_PIP_9_26_18.pdf?ver=2018-09-26-142912-117). Permanency 2 data (Items 7-11) are not listed in the data included in the PIP because the measurement plan for the PIP does not include any Permanency 2 items. It has not been determined if this data will be provided at this point. Individual county data for the 23 PIP counties is available and does include this information.
- PIP Baseline has been established for the 23 known counties. The goal is for all counties to be “fully implemented” with Case Reviews. Once your county is fully implemented, your County Consultant will be more frequently communicating with you. CDSS considers the following for full implementation of Case Review:
  - Staffing capacity to complete the case review (ie: how many reviewers, how many QA staff?)
  - Application and understanding of the OSRI and the case review process
  - Analysis of case review productivity from quarter to quarter (ie: How many cases should the county be completing each quarter? How many are the completing each quarter?)
  - How case review resources are used in the county?
  - Has county received any second level QA from CDSS? Technical assistance?
  - Other things may be factors, too.

**County Sharing:** Item dilemma, something to share that would be helpful for other Case Reviewers to know, or questions that have come up.

- Santa Clara: a few cases have come up for review that have been in “active trial mode” with County Counsel/DA, including one that had a very contested hearing. County Counsel recommended that the Case Review team NOT contact

the family; CDSS granted an exemption. What have other counties done when the case is “high profile” or very contentious. Contra Costa had a similar case; the mother came to the interview with her attorney – the Case Reviewer made it very clear that this information was confidential. Monterey also had a similar situation and the parent’s (private) attorney advised the parent not to respond to the interview. Santa Cruz’s approach has been that it’s non-negotiable and they will sometimes engage with the parents’ attorneys in advance. The Case Review team in Santa Cruz also has built relationships with the attorneys and they always pose it as a non-negotiable but sometimes they’ll wait for a trial to be over. The Case Review should not be considered discoverable information because it generally isn’t new information; more to come at the upcoming 11/13/18 CDSS Case Review webinar.

- Contra Costa: Child was removed from her mother and then living with her guardians (aunt and uncle) but was removed (and guardians did not ask for reunification) and then in long-term foster care and then was NMD status. Question was who is considered the parent – the guardians (aunt and uncle) because the guardianship was finalized. These cases are treated like adoption cases. However, this situation was very case specific and should always be brought to your County Consultant when in doubt.
- Monterey: PUR only has two months before the case was dismissed. Monterey has a practice of after a guardianship is set up and the case is dismissed, the case is kept open in CWS/CMS to monitor guardianship payment. The implication is that the worker sees the child for 6 months. Case was then reviewed for only the two months – not any of the time it was open for payment monitoring. Naming things that happened outside of the PUR but support your ratings can be a useful for CDSS, too.
- San Francisco: Had 3 Probation cases last quarter and looking for sample OSRIs with redacted information; the cases tend to take longer to complete and the information is a little bit different. CDSS will share some redacted samples.
- Marin: Wants clarity on relative placement; what’s the difference between a relative who *could* be reassessed and a relative who *should* be reassessed? What are the variables? Some of it depends on the reasons why they weren’t approved in the first place and whether it will evolve over time? Similar to Marin – Santa Cruz wants to know what the expectation is for the agency to look for relatives when the family is on track to go home or the case is on track for permanency. Part of the design from ACF was to give states latitude in making some of these decisions; CDSS will bring these questions back to their team to discuss and work toward inter rater reliability and ensure they’re all on the same page. But always making a decision that’s in the best interest of the child is at the heart of the matter.
- Alameda: Wants clarification on how to document referrals when a TPR has been issued against the parent and they had a child after this took place; there’s still a connection between the target child and the parent even though there’s a TPR. There are two FAQs that address this – 1) in the general section 2) in the safety

outcome section; the response from ACF is contradictory so CDSS will be bringing this to ACF to get clarification. One thing to clarify: if TPR occurred prior to the PUR then referrals on siblings don't go into Item 1.

- Santa Cruz: Case where guardianship was established in 2012 and the agency has maintained the dependency. Permanency goal is guardianship – which has been achieved – but not because she's still in foster care and the youth's goal was to be an NMD. Youth also turned 18 during the PUR. Agency has kept the case open for an abnormal reason. Permanency goal wasn't written accurately. Depending on how you answer Item 5, it will impact Item 6. Question: do you count the permanency goal as guardianship even though it's not the real goal? Count it but say it wasn't appropriate to the child's needs in terms of permanency, and that it didn't match the circumstances of the case.

**Networking Lunch:** Case Review contact list update.

**CQI focus on Transparency - discussion on Items 8 & 11** (Maryanne Rehberg)

### **Closing and Next Steps**

- Important dates:
  - CDSS Case Review webinar – November 13, 2018 / 2-3:30pm
  - QA training in Fresno – December 1, 2018
  - 4-day Case Review training in Berkeley – February 5-8, 2019
  - NEW DATE for Q3 Bay Area Learning Collaborative – February 13, 2019
  - CQI Conference in Davis – March 27-28, 2019
  - Q4 Bay Area Learning Collaborative – May 8, 2019