



Legislative
Services Agency

FINAL REPORT

Child Welfare Service System Redesign Monitoring Committee

January 2004

MEMBERS

Senator Maggie Tinsman, Cochairperson
Senator Jack Hatch
Senator Amanda Ragan
Senator James Seymour
Senator Kenneth Veenstra

Representative Dave Heaton, Cochairperson
Representative Carmine Boal
Representative Ro Foege
Representative Lisa Heddens
Representative Linda Upmeyer

Staff Contacts:

John Pollak, Committee Services
Administrator, Legal Services Division,
(515) 281-3818
john.pollak@legis.state.ia.us

Patty Funaro, Senior Legal Counsel,
Legal Services Division,
(515) 281-3040
patty.funaro@legis.state.ia.us

Staff Contacts:

- I. Background and Overview
- II. August 18 Meeting
- III. September 24 Meeting
- IV. October 22 Meeting
- V. December 15 Meeting
- VI. Recommendations
- VII. Materials Distributed to the Monitoring Committee

CREATION AND CHARGE

The Child Welfare Service System Redesign Monitoring Committee was created for the 2003 Legislative Interim by the Legislative Council pursuant to 2003 Iowa Acts, chapter 178 (SF 453), section 44. The council expanded the membership from the six provided for in the legislation to 10 members. The legislation charged the Committee to "provide advice and consultation to the department [of human services] and consider any legislative changes that may be needed for implementation" of the redesign prepared by the department.



Child Welfare Service System Redesign Committee

I. Background and Overview.

A. Background. SF 453 (often referred to as the "Reinvention Bill") directed the Department of Human Services (DHS) to implement a redesign of child welfare and juvenile justice services to an outcome-based system. Implementation of the redesign plan was scheduled to begin on January 1, 2004. The FY 2003-2004 appropriations made to DHS for services, staffing, and support relating to these services were generally reduced by \$10 million with the Governor required to identify and apply specific reductions no later than the redesign implementation date. DHS implemented an extensive process to develop the redesign elements and receive public input. The first draft of the redesign proposal was issued on September 3, 2003, the second draft was issued on September 22, and the third draft was issued on October 17. Director Kevin Concannon made major decisions on the redesign on December 8, 2003, when the final report was released.

B. Overview. The Monitoring Committee meetings generally were held close to the dates on which DHS issued a draft redesign plan. In all, four separate drafts were issued. Meetings were held at the Statehouse on August 18, September 24, October 22, and December 15. In addition, with assistance from the Human Services Reform Project of the National Conference of State Legislatures, Cochairperson Heaton, Representative Foege, and legislative staff joined executive and judicial branch staff in a September site visit to child welfare programs in Wisconsin. Cochairperson Tinsman visited the program in Milwaukee at a different time. The Monitoring Committee provided input on each draft of the redesign. The Monitoring Committee did not adopt formal recommendations, but members noted that the deliberations and discussion would be of great assistance as statutory changes and funding needs are debated by the General Assembly.

II. August 18 Meeting.

Overview. The Monitoring Committee organized and conducted initial business, electing Senator Tinsman and Representative Heaton as cochairpersons. An overview of the current child welfare and juvenile justice system was provided through a panel presentation, DHS Director Concannon provided an update of the redesign effort, information was provided concerning a required federal review of the system, and fiscal information was distributed and discussed.

Current System Overview. This five-person panel covered what currently happens with a typical child in need of assistance (CINA) case and a typical juvenile delinquency case, the role played by particular aspects of the system, and major strengths and weaknesses of the current system.

- **DHS.** Mr. Evan Klenk, DHS Service Area Manager from Waterloo, provided a flow chart and demographic information concerning the CINA process. In 2000, 28,210 children were served; many also were served in other major DHS programs such as the Family Investment Program and child support. He listed as strengths the quality



of the workers, contribution of partners, and history of successful collaboration among those who deal with children. Identified weaknesses include very high caseloads, lack of advanced professional training, and fragmented quality assurance.

- **Juvenile Court Services.** Ms. Marilyn Lantz, Chief Juvenile Court Officer, Fifth Judicial District, described the process for children who commit a juvenile delinquent act or other crime. She noted that the major components of the system are dealing with safety of the child and community, ensuring accountability of the offender to the victim and the community, and strengthening the skills the child needs to succeed in life. Approximately 24,000 new cases entered the system in 2002 and approximately 19,000 of these cases were handled informally by Juvenile Court Services workers. Of the approximately 5,000 cases that went before the juvenile court, 505 children were ordered into an out-of-home placement. She suggested that the medical model used for those services funded by Medicaid hampers efforts to deal with the whole family.
- **Private Providers.** Mr. Jim Ernst, Executive Director of Four Oaks in Cedar Rapids, represented the private agencies of the Coalition for Child and Family Services in Iowa. He suggested that many system resources are committed to regulatory and case oversight and case management that could otherwise be committed to direct service to children. Strengths identified include the quality of DHS and Juvenile Court Services workers, the quality of private agency social and youth workers, and Iowa's practice of combining the systems for CINA, juvenile delinquency, and children's mental health. Weaknesses identified include requiring a child's circumstances to reach the serious level before assistance is provided, excessive paperwork and bureaucracy, and committing too many resources to oversight and management functions.
- **Juvenile Court.** Ms. Gail Barber, Administrator of the Judicial Branch's Court Improvement Project, described the project's efforts to improve court processes, such as recent reductions in termination of parental rights appeals from 13.2 months to 63 days. Discussion centered on the need to improve data systems, impact of federal requirements on the decisions of judges, and interest in a court process that is not adversarial to meet the needs of families with a child with disabilities.
- **Community Role in Child Welfare.** Mr. Dick Moore, Administrator of the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning of the Department of Human Rights, discussed the importance of engaging community resources in addressing the needs of families. He identified many specific programs and other supports that address child welfare and juvenile justice needs, including the special education and alternative high school system, extended family and friends, and child welfare funding decategorization projects. He encouraged members to consider all of these programs and supports in any restructuring of child welfare services.

A. Redesign Process. DHS Director Concannon described the recently concluded process used to collect public input regarding the redesign of child welfare services. He reported that a group was meeting to develop a design proposal for which broad public input was being invited. Director Concannon believes that new efforts to claim federal



Child Welfare Service System Redesign Committee

funding available for certain child welfare funding and the enhanced federal match for Medicaid under state fiscal relief provisions would be sufficient to offset the required reduction in child welfare funding. He noted that the federal trend has been to sunset or cap flexible funding streams and related recently received letters regarding the federal government moving to disallow \$10 million in Medicaid funding for child welfare services. He noted his plans to initiate additional efforts to increase Iowa's claiming of other federal funding streams.

Child and Family Services Review. Iowa was completing a multiyear process of reviewing child and family services, in compliance with federal requirements. Ms. Mary Nelson, DHS administrator, described the status of the review. The review involved collection of data on outcomes and performance indicators as well as review of case files and interviews. Once Iowa received the federal government analysis of the state's performance, DHS was required to submit a program improvement plan to address weaknesses. It appeared that Iowa has good performance in placing siblings that have been removed from their home, judicial review of cases, and responsiveness and collaboration within communities. Likely areas for the improvement plan are worker visits with foster care children and their families, worker caseloads, and quality assurance efforts.

Fiscal Information. Ms. Lisa Burk, Fiscal Services Division, Legislative Services Agency, distributed an analysis of the state and federal funding for child welfare. The information included both historical data and budget projections.

Discussion. Senator Hatch urged Committee members to approve a letter to legislative leaders and the Governor, expressing legislative intent to delay implementation of the service system redesign. His proposals were not acted upon by the Committee. There was extensive discussion of the impacts of recent budget actions, including expenditure of child welfare funding decategorization carryover balances.

III. September 24 Meeting.

Financial Information. Ms. Lisa Burk, LSA, Fiscal Services Division, Ms. Jan Clausen, DHS Budget Officer, and Ms. Mary Nelson, DHS Division Administrator, discussed the components and services that comprise the budget and expenditures for child welfare. In addition, information was provided concerning the state and federal funding sources for the expenditures. The most significant federal sources are provided under federal Social Security Act Titles IV-A, IV-B, and IV-E, and Title XIX (Medicaid). The annual budget for FY 2002-2003 was approximately \$205 million, of which approximately half was from state sources and the remainder from federal and other sources. Senator Hatch distributed letters requesting support from Director Concannon and legislative leaders for a supplemental appropriation to provide additional funding for the child welfare system.

Redesign Discussion. Director Concannon, Ms. Nelson, and Ms. Wendy Rickman, DHS Service Area Manager from the Quad Cities area, provided an overview of the recently issued second draft of the redesign proposal. The draft outlines a result-focused initiative



with DHS and Juvenile Court Services (JCS) staff assuming responsibility for securing results. There was comment and reaction from Committee members on recommendation items throughout the meeting, including the following:

- **Target the population that presents the most difficult challenges.** The second draft includes an initial list of characteristics of families that would be targeted, such as multiple re-entries into the child welfare and involvement with multiple human services systems. Committee members suggested inclusion of poor school attendance or performance, noting that targeting this behavior would also be of interest to the education system. Several noted that caseworkers have different skill sets and that this approach would allow those workers with particular skills to focus on the children and families with which they do the best work.
- **Improve assessments of children and family strengths and needs.** DHS representatives noted that a new assessment model for child welfare cases would be implemented in October. It was reported that JCS planned to implement a new model, statewide, for juvenile justice cases within 18 months, and the design team requested that JCS consider a faster implementation schedule. It was suggested that that two systems use the same assessment model and there were questions regarding whether the acceleration would have a budget impact.
- **Shift to a family-centered practice.** Many members expressed strong support for this element. Some cautioned that the federal government may not allow this broader emphasis to replace the focus on the child currently required in the Rehabilitative Treatment Service System (RTSS) funded by Medicaid. Legislators offered to assist in this and other efforts to change federal policy by intervening with federal officials when appropriate.
- **Increase public and private caseworker time with families.** Research indicates that such time increases result in greater success for families in the system. It was suggested that a beneficial practice may be to maintain the same caseworker throughout a child or family's involvement with the system.
- **Reduce paperwork.** Reducing paperwork is an important strategy in a number of the redesign areas of focus. The recommended strategy is to identify changes that can be made relatively quickly at the same time more comprehensive efforts are made. Legislators suggested that technology changes would greatly assist the reduction and changes should be implemented in a manner so that DHS and JCS can exchange information electronically.
- **Purchase outcomes and results rather than process.** There was general support for this approach, but some cautions and questions were expressed. Several Committee members were skeptical about the notion in the draft of paying bonuses for those providers that meet or exceed outcome targets. It was suggested that a provider will maintain or increase their business when outcomes are achieved.
- **Enhance the case management role.** The draft recommends that the public agencies retain the case management role for the targeted cases and maintain lower caseloads for these cases. The draft makes a distinction between case monitoring and case coordination functions. Many members agreed with requests made by other groups



Child Welfare Service System Redesign Committee

for the design team to provide options for some functions to be assumed by private providers.

- **Improve practice at transition points.** The draft underscored the need to be more effective in helping children and families in completing system transition points. Several members emphasized the importance of this item.
- **Focus on a limited number of outcomes.** This item is also important to members.

Other Areas of Concerns and Suggestions.

- **Education System.** Members expressed the need for the educational system to be more involved in the process. It was suggested that school social workers, superintendents, and area education agency staff become involved in the redesign process. One member observed that the staff involved with the education and child welfare systems have very different outlooks and it will take a lot of effort for the systems to work together effectively.
- **Cultural Competence.** The redesign draft notes the relatively high proportion of persons of color, Native Americans, and other minority populations in the child welfare population and stresses the importance of system approaches that competently deal with the cultural differences. Members expressed support for this emphasis.
- **Prevention.** There are many forms of prevention under discussion ranging from prevention of any contact with the child welfare system to prevention of the need for termination of parental rights over a child that is already in contact with the system.
- **MH/DD Redesign.** It was noted that DHS is also involved in a redesign of the adult Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities (MH/DD) Service System with plans to address children's MH/DD services in 2004. DHS staff described the efforts being made to coordinate and communicate between the redesign efforts.
- **Organizational Culture.** Members noted that the redesign is likely to fail unless public and private employees become committed to changing their approach to child welfare needs.

Wisconsin Child Welfare Wraparound Services. Cochairpersons Heaton and Tinsman, Representative Foege, Mr. Eric Sage of the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning of the Department of Human Rights, Ms. Burk, and Mr. John Pollak of LSA Legal Services discussed site visits made along with DHS and JCS staff and consultant staff members to learn about urban and rural programs for child welfare in Wisconsin. It was suggested that these programs have many of the same objectives as the Iowa redesign plan and have valuable experiences in purchasing results to improve outcomes for targeted populations. The rural and urban programs visited use the same model but are organized quite differently. Members suggested it may be appropriate to also utilize different organizational models in Iowa.

Center for the Study of Social Policy. Ms. Marno Batterson, Senior Associate for the Center, identified key elements of child welfare reform in other states and made suggestions for Iowa's redesign plan. She emphasized the importance of meeting the needs of families in order to ensure that children can safely stay with those families. She distributed lists to members containing important elements and suggestions and discussed



each item on the lists. The items range from the family emphasis and focus on strengthening families' informal supports to investment in economic development so that families have a reasonable income. She recommended expansion of the existing family partnership initiatives as a fruitful means for implementing the redesign plan.

IV. October 22 Meeting.

Overview. Presentations were made regarding the recently completed federal Child and Family Service Review and the third draft of the redesign plan. Both items were extensively discussed.

Federal Child and Family Service Review (CFSR). Iowa was involved in a multiyear process of reviewing the child and family welfare services system to determine compliance with federal requirements. The federal government issued the final report of its review of Iowa's system on October 15, 2003, and the state was allowed 90 days to develop and submit a program improvement plan to the federal government. The review was based upon a combination of statistical information, stakeholder interviews, and case evaluations resulting in a report of determinations as to the state's compliance with various federally identified outcomes and systemic factors. The state is subject to financial penalties if the nonconformance continues. Of the first 32 states subject to review, no state was found in total compliance.

CFSR Outcomes and Factors – State in Compliance. The federal government found the state was in compliance with the following:

- Safety Outcome 2 — Children are safely maintained in their homes when possible and appropriate
- Well-Being Outcome 2 — Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs
- Statewide information system factor
- Agency responsiveness to community factor
- Foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention factor

CFSR Outcomes and Factors – State in Noncompliance. The federal government found the state is out of compliance with the following:

- Safety Outcome 1 — Children are first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect
- Permanency Outcome 1 — Children have permanency and stability in their living situations
- Permanency Outcome 2 — The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children
- Well-Being Outcome 1 — Families have enhanced capacity to provide for the children's needs
- Well-Being Outcome 3 — Children receive services to meet their physical and mental health needs
- Case review system factor



Child Welfare Service System Redesign Committee

- Quality assurance system factor
- Training factor
- Service Array factor

Child Welfare Redesign – Third Draft. Ms. Rickman and Ms. Clausen of the DHS redesign team discussed the third draft of the redesign plan issued on October 17, 2003. The draft was subject to public comments during the week of October 20 and DHS Director Concannon planned to complete his review and issue his decision about the redesign in early November. This plan was later revised for his decision to be issued December 8, 2003.

Member Comments. Members asked questions of and made comments to the redesign team including the following:

- **Targeted Population Segment.** The third draft of the redesign suggests targeting the segment of the child welfare population that has the most significant needs. The redesign team intended to narrow the focus on this segment to encompass approximately 350-400 children statewide. The majority of the members supported this approach, but some members hoped more children could be included in the targeted segment.
- **Initial Approach.** A desire was expressed to start the redesign on a small scale in order to learn from successes and mistakes. The draft provides options to either refer the targeted segment cases to a specialized statewide team or to authorize the DHS service area manager and colleagues in Juvenile Court Services to work out an approach for that area. Members supported further development of these options. There was some interest in implementing a statewide approach as soon as possible.
- **Purchasing Considerations.** The redesign team was working on options to purchase and pay for the results desired for children and families. Several members expressed the belief that paying bonuses for performance is a mistake. They believe the successful providers would be rewarded with continued business and unsuccessful providers would no longer be retained to provide services. Others noted that rural areas of the state often do not have many providers from which to choose and that a different type of purchasing might be needed for these areas.
- **Case Coordinator.** The third redesign draft includes a distinction between the role of the case manager and the case coordinator that would do the most work directly with children and families. In a departure from previous drafts, the case coordinator role would be a private sector function. Members expressed agreement with that approach, and emphasized the importance of the case coordinator role, maintaining relatively low caseloads, doing what it takes to meet an individual family's needs, and for the coordinators to work flexible hours to fit into family schedules. Ideally, the same case coordinator would remain throughout the period of a family's contact with the system.
- **Paperwork.** Both the presenters and members emphasized the need to curtail the amount of paperwork currently required in the system.
- **System Collaboration.** Significant discussion occurred around the involvement of workers from DHS, juvenile court, education and special education, private providers,



and other welfare agencies with some families that have many needs. The system redesign would seek to eliminate unnecessary duplication.

- **Assessment.** The redesign would emphasize the importance of assessment. Members urged that the various systems involved with children and families work as collaboratively as possible to eliminate the duplication of conducting different assessments and then formulating treatment plans without involving the other systems that deal with the families. It was noted that efforts were underway for the technology used by the various systems to be able to communicate more effectively.
- **Meeting Needs.** Members noted that families with children with mental health, developmental disabilities, or other serious conditions with significant needs often cannot currently access services without a court determination that the child is in need of assistance. There was general agreement on the need for continued work on this problem.

V. December 15 Meeting.

Overview. At the final meeting, the monitoring committee heard a presentation from DHS Director Concannon reflecting his decisions on the redesign, and comments on the redesign from three chief juvenile court officers, child welfare private providers, a representative of juvenile court judges, and the Child and Family Policy Center. Committee members asked many questions and commented extensively concerning the redesign.

Redesign Final Report. The final report was issued on December 8. Director Concannon was assisted in his presentation by project manager Wendy Rickman. The presentation and discussion covered the final report, the DHS recommendation to address the \$10 million appropriation reduction, and recommendations for statutory changes that may be needed to support the redesign. The report addressed these key points:

- **Family Team Meetings.** Under the report if a child comes into contact with the child welfare system, the child's family would be engaged through a team process involving all systems that deal with the family. Much greater efforts would be made to identify people, organizations, and services to support a family within the community.
- **Community Care.** Those families identified through a child protection allegation, determined to be of lower risk, would benefit from services offered through a private, community provider. A DHS service case file would not be opened and broad outcome measures would be assessed.
- **Children of Color.** Two requests for proposals would be issued for initiatives to address the outcome gaps for children of color. In addition, DHS would contract for statewide technical assistance from the Disproportionate Minority Contact Resource Center at the University of Iowa.
- **Case Responsibilities.** The redesign report distinguishes case monitoring from case coordination responsibilities, with the coordinator role involving significant "face time" with children and families. DHS reported its plan to revise its worker roles between the two sets of responsibilities as part of the effort to reduce caseloads.



Child Welfare Service System Redesign Committee

- **Population Differentiation.** In addition to the community care effort, subject to federal waiver approval, DHS would purchase case coordination services from the private sector for those children with a court order for group foster care.
- **Outcomes.** This draft of the report includes more detail to better define the outcomes desired.
- **System Linkages.** Specific steps are outlined to formalize links between the child welfare and education systems through the use of statewide and service area memorandums of agreement and understanding.
- **Statutory Changes.** Areas for statutory changes include: removal of the need to show good cause in certain child in need of assistance voluntary cases, providing flexibility in court orders to allow movement to different placements without a hearing if all parties are in agreement, creating a financing account for the community care proposal, authorizing the county attorney to represent agents of the department in CINA hearings, and allowing custody transfers in delinquency cases to be made to a chief juvenile court officer or designee in lieu of DHS.

Member Discussion. Members expressed strong support for the general direction of the redesign, while expressing some concerns about specific elements. The general support and set of concerns were echoed by others throughout the day during the presentations. Areas for comment included the following:

- **Faith-Based Organizations.** DHS was strongly encouraged by some to look to faith-based and community organizations to assist in providing support for families.
- **Culture Change Challenges.** Several cautioned that the redesign proposes significant changes in outlook and behavior from both public and private sector staff and the change might need much support and patience. Significant work would be needed in clarifying the roles of public and private sector staff in the redesigned system. Special efforts might be needed to engage the education system with the child welfare system and in utilizing community support.
- **Underfunding.** Many expressed concern that the child welfare system is significantly underfunded and believe that change will be slow unless resources are made available for the costs of change and for needed services. A number asked about existing waiting lists and probable funding shortages in group foster and shelter care. The redesign includes long-term strategies to address these needs; it was reported that individual service areas were initiating ways to address these needs in the short term.
- **Federal Flexibility.** Nearly half the current funding for the child welfare and juvenile justice system comes from the federal government. The redesign would seek federal flexibility in how services are documented, bundled, and reimbursed. Some noted that it can take a year or more for federal approval of significant changes. DHS has committed to making the changes within its purview, but much hinges on federal approval in the areas of Medicaid and Title IV-E of the Social Security Act. Legislative members discussed recent signals that federal attitudes have shifted toward making granting of waivers and other flexibility easier.



- **Children With Disabilities.** In addition to the statutory change proposals made by DHS, Representative Heddens distributed a list of proposals intended to help families with a child with disabilities or other special needs obtain assistance without having to relinquish custody of the child.
- **Building on Existing Efforts.** Some noted that approximately 30 counties are involved in community partnership approaches to child protection and these approaches, along with the quality of service review process, community empowerment, and child welfare funding decategorization projects, provide a good foundation for utilizing the family-centered and community-based approaches proposed. DHS staff cautioned that some time will be needed to engage statewide acceptance of these approaches as those involved must believe in it in order to be successful.

Appropriation Reduction. Director Concannon noted that Senate File 453 requires consultation with the legislative monitoring committee as well as the Council on Human Services in addressing the \$10 million in appropriation reductions for FY 2003-2004 required by the legislation. He distributed a memorandum proposing that the reductions will be offset by federal sources of one-time funding: the temporary increase in federal matching funds for Medicaid in law approved by the President and new claiming of federal block grant funding. He noted that DHS has asked for restoration of the reduced amount for FY 2004-2005.

Chief Juvenile Court Officers. Three of the state's eight chief juvenile court officers (JCOs) appeared before the Committee: Ms. Marilyn Lantz of the 5th Judicial District in central Iowa, Ms. Pat Hendrickson of the 7th Judicial District in the Quad Cities area, and Mr. John Wauters of the 8th Judicial District in the southeast area of the state. They expressed support for the general direction of the plan but had concerns that implementing a family team meeting for each case may not be a beneficial use of resources; that maintaining a consistent case coordinator with each juvenile delinquency case may not be appropriate so that transitions between workers assigned to children and families will still need attention; and dealing with juvenile delinquency cases has some different goals and objectives, particularly with community safety, than are used for child welfare cases. Several members questioned plans for Juvenile Court Services and DHS to utilize different assessment tools with children and families. The JCOs expressed willingness to work on eliminating collection of duplicative information between the two systems.

Coalition for Children and Family Services in Iowa. Mr. Kim Schmett, Coalition Executive Director, and Ms. Ann Harrmann, Coalition Associate Executive Director, addressed the viewpoint of service providers. They cautioned that the new approach emphasizing outcomes should be implemented in a manner that reduces paperwork and noted that the measures identified in a previous effort have yet to be implemented; suggested that incentives for achieving results are needed along with protection for risks that are outside a provider's control; expressed concern about family foster care providers that deal with as many as 10 children and the need for emergency support for such large provider situations; expressed concerns about the effects of waiting lists and caps in group foster and shelter care; and expressed the belief that additional work is needed to more



Child Welfare Service System Redesign Committee

appropriately assign roles and responsibilities between the public and private sectors, providing the example that the state juvenile intuitions are an expensive component but not addressed in the plan.

Juvenile Judges. Ms. Gail Barber, Director of the Court Improvement Project, a federally funded effort to improve the operation of the juvenile court, discussed reactions collected from juvenile judges. She noted that the strictures of judicial ethics have precluded direct judicial involvement with the redesign process and that she had collected comments in a manner that would not raise ethical concerns. The comments included: there is support for the family-centered approach with an interest in how it will be implemented and whether it will be appropriate in each case; training will be needed for all involved; DHS caseload reductions will be helpful; compliance with federal requirements resulting from the recent review is needed; the issue of whether courts will receive appropriate information about those community-based cases in which a DHS file is not opened; the concern that outcomes and incentives should be carefully designed so as to not result in decision making for financial considerations that are not in a child's best interest; and the issue of whether a private provider operating as the care coordinator will appear in court in lieu of the current practice of utilizing the DHS staff. It was noted in discussion that while some juvenile courts operate differently based upon the judges and other personnel involved, many courts already operate with the proposed statutory change to waive hearings if all agree; however, in order to ensure due process, the parties must receive adequate notice. Members requested that judges and courts be asked to review paperwork requirements. Ms. Barber described a project underway to assess the contents of juvenile records and agreed to report on the project at a later date. Other members discussed the work of guardians ad litem.

Child and Family Policy Center. Mr. Charles Bruner, Center Executive Director and former state senator, discussed previous efforts to reform the system and emphasized these points: implementing seamless case planning and management will not be easy to do, recognizing that challenges to implementing change are significant – particularly with an underfunded system, engaging community involvement with families is particularly important, securing appropriate federal flexibility is vital to the success of the redesign, and understanding the significant changes in practice that are proposed for public and private service providers.

VI. Recommendations.

Members expressed appreciation for the efforts of DHS and all other involved, noting the importance of engaging the juvenile court, private providers, Juvenile Court Services, educators, communities, and others as this is vital to the success of the redesign although no formal recommendations were approved. The cochairpersons stated that the deliberations of the monitoring committee would be of great assistance when the statutory changes and funding needs are debated in the Legislature.



VII. Materials Distributed to the Monitoring Committee.

A. August 18 Materials.

1. An overview of the service system redesign effort to date, prepared by John Pollak, LSA Legal Services
2. Meeting notes from a panel presentation made at the July 2003 National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) meeting on reforming child welfare systems, prepared by John Pollak, LSA Legal Services
3. Child Welfare Services Funding and Expenditure Details: A spreadsheet regarding a history of child welfare service system funding, prepared by Lisa Burk, LSA Fiscal Services
4. Draft child welfare service system redesign parameters (from DHS) <http://www.dhs.state.ia.us/BetterResultsforKids/documents/Draft%206%20Design%20Parameters%2007-30-03.doc>
5. Draft child welfare service system outcomes (from DHS) <http://www.dhs.state.ia.us/BetterResultsforKids/documents/Outcomes%207-30-03%20-%20with%20edits2.doc>
6. Executive Summary of the Statewide Child and Family Services Assessment submitted to the federal government by DHS in March 2003 (from DHS) <http://www.dhs.state.ia.us/Publications/CSFR0403/CFSR%20Executive%20Summary.doc>
7. Panel on Current Child Welfare System Handouts:
 - a. Evan Klenk, DHS Service Area Manager, Area 2, Waterloo:
 - Total DHS Clients Served
 - Flow Chart of Child and Family Service in DHS Case Management System
 - Flow Chart of Community Support for Families in the Waterloo Area
 - Strengths and Weaknesses of Current System
 - b. Marilyn Lantz, Chief Juvenile Court Officer, Fifth Judicial District, Polk and Surrounding Counties:
 - Overview of Iowa Juvenile Court Services
 - Polk County Juvenile Court Services – Continuum of Services
 - Study of Juvenile Court Delinquency Referrals: 1009-2001
 - c. Gail Barber, Iowa Court Improvement Project:
 - Time Frame for Child In Need of Assistance Hearings
 - Parent's Juvenile Court Handbook
 - d. Jim Ernst, Executive Director, Four Oaks, Cedar Rapids, Coalition for Child and Family Services in Iowa:



Child Welfare Service System Redesign Committee

- Child Welfare/Juvenile Justice System Private Provider – Desired Role Graphic of Current Case and Regulatory Oversight and Case Management Functions
- Key for the Graphic of Current Case and Regulatory Oversight and Case Management Functions
- e. Dick Moore, Administrator of the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning of the Department of Human Rights:
 - Programs, Officials and Other That Comprise and Support Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice in Iowa Communities
- 8. Kevin Concannon, Director of Human Services:
 - Child Welfare Redesign Listening Report, July 2003
- 9. Mary Nelson, Division Administrator, Department of Human Services:
 - Federal Child and Family Services Review Information

B. September 24 Materials.

1. Minutes of August 18, 2003, meeting
2. Wisconsin Wraparound Services for Child Welfare: Site Visit Report, prepared by John Pollak, LSA Legal Services
3. Milwaukee Wraparound 2002 Annual Report
4. FPI Wraparound Statistics
5. Purchased Services Descriptions (from DHS)
6. Explanation of Purchased Services Descriptions (from DHS)
7. Second Draft – DHS Child Welfare Redesign
8. Second Draft of Redesign – DHS PowerPoint Presentation
9. Marno Batterson, Senior Associate, Center for the Study of Social Policy:
 - Key Elements for Success in Reforming Child Welfare
 - Iowa Strengths for Reforming Child Welfare

C. October 22 Materials.

1. Minutes of September 24, 2003, meeting
2. Updated spreadsheet regarding child welfare funding
3. Third Draft – DHS Child Welfare Redesign – Issued 10/17/03
4. Iowa Results from Federal Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) – DHS Presentation



5. CFSR Federal Letter and Report Executive Summary
6. Child Welfare Redesign Third Draft – DHS PowerPoint Presentation
7. Purchased Services Descriptions (revised by DHS)

D. December 15 Materials.

1. Minutes of October 22, 2003, meeting
2. Response to Committee request to identify shelter care providers that also provide group foster care (DHS)
3. Federal Child and Family Service Review Final Report – Budget and Caseload References (DHS)
4. DHS response to budget impact questions
5. DHS recommendation to address the \$10 million reduction in DHS appropriations required by SF 453
6. DHS Redesign of Iowa's Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice System:
 - a. "Better Results" Child Plan Approved News Release
 - b. Final Report
 - c. Final Report PowerPoint Presentation
 - d. Child Welfare by the Numbers
 - e. How Iowa's New Child Welfare System Will Approach Issues Differently: Case Examples
7. Materials distributed by the Department of Human Services:
 - a. Overview of Redesign Final Report Document
 - b. DHS Legislative Proposals to support Child Welfare/Juvenile Justice Redesign
 - c. Letter from Director Concannon to Christine Louscher and DHS Council concerning \$10 million reduction
8. Materials distributed by the Coalition for Family and Children Services:
 - a. Actual Cost of Living Adjustment vs. Provider Cost Adjustment
 - b. Comparison of State and Private Agency Staff Salaries
 - c. Effects of Budget Cuts on Child Welfare Services (Omaha World-Herald)