

BELKNAP COUNTY SERVICE INTEGRATION INITIATIVE
RESOURCE INVENTORY & ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
MEETING OF JULY 21, 2009

SUMMARY

Attending: Richard Moed, Betty Anson, Maggie Pritchard, Jennifer Sylvia, Christa Clapp, Jessica Blais, Ray Barrett, Sandy Loomis, Lisa Morris, Jack Terrill, Deb Rosato, Tom Swett, Dan French, Kathleen Companion. **Staff:** Judy Buswell, Alan Robichaud
Consultant: John Tuell, CWLA

1. Activity Reports – Updates

A. Legal & Policy Committee ~ Maggie Pritchard reported continued work by committee members to identify challenges and opportunities to information sharing and case coordination. Facilitated discussions are being conducted by committee members and will be reported at the committee's August meeting. Also being discussed are methods of obtaining more information on the targeted population of youth.

B. Evidence-Based Practice Inquiry ~ Jessica Blais distributed a grid of pertinent EBP promoted by national organizations and agencies across issue areas e.g. substance abuse, mental health, juvenile delinquency, and the like. She also offered a couple of definitions of evidence-based practices found on the National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices and used by the state of New Hampshire. These definitions and models of EBP will be used in establishing an inventory of the practices used by providers in Belknap County as a continuing part of this inquiry.

C. Process Map Compilations ~ Deb Rosato reviewed the various maps she has compiled in the past few weeks. These maps served as the main focus of today's discussion. The group acknowledged the tremendous effort put forth in compiling these maps and thanked Deb and the many agency representatives who participated in making them available for today's discussion.

2. Facilitated Session – John Tuell

John reviewed the history and background to this initiative for new participants. He indicated that the focused discussion of the meeting is directed at the targeted population of youth (1 in 6) who enter the juvenile justice system (in Belknap County) with a founded history of dependency. The discussion focused on agency roles and assessments performed during the pre-adjudication phase of youth delinquency engagement.

Rather than attempt to capture the lengthy discussions of the meeting, what follows are key points, questions and next steps needed to move forward.

Throughout the discussion there were references made to the fact that there exist many collaborative, coordinated processes shared between DJJS and DCYF particularly as it pertains to the shared cases. However this does not necessarily hold true for the

involvement of other service components such as mental health, substance abuse intervention services and education unless specifically joined in the case by the court.

Christa indicated there is a shared policy for working jointly on a case (DJJS and DCYF). **A copy of this policy was requested.**

What appear to be operational practices between DJJS and DCYF at the District Office level do not necessarily translate into policy across state systems. There is concern that if current personnel were ever to change, there would be a loss of important relationships and practices that address joint services for youth. The group felt that at the point of adjudication, there needs to be a protocol in place that is child and family focused and addresses the role of all essential services. Whereas the court has the most authority for children and families, this is a crucial point of coordination.

At the point of arrest, a juvenile is recommended for either diversion or court processing based on the prosecutor's assessment of the youth's prior offenses, acceptance of responsibility and degree to which a youth is felt to be able to benefit by the program. Delinquency petitions are filed by police departments while CHINS may be filed by police, schools and parents based on meeting certain criteria including the exhaustion of all other available and appropriate community service alternatives.

The school is automatically joined to the case by the court whenever there is a situation involving abuse or neglect. Christa indicated that whenever a child is in a home that is under an abuse and neglect investigation, that child is referred to early intervention.

The Pre-Disposition Investigation (PDI) is a critical point that provides the best opportunity to develop more interagency engagement through shared protocols, assessments, and case planning and coordination. It is the point at which much of the youth's family, medical, social and education history is accumulated and synthesized for recommendations. Dan French estimates the average PDI to take 14 hours to complete.

DCFY also conducts detailed and extensive inquiry under their Structured Decision-Making (SDM) model (includes risk assessment, reunification assessment, educational history, medical history, mental health history, assessment of safety, permanency and well-being). In terms of case reviews, "well-being" is always an "area needing improvement (ANI)". It appears that the richest body of information on the child and family rests within the DCYF case file.

When involved with behavioral health services, youth are administered the CAFAS (Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale). The CAFAS is a rating scale which assesses the youth's degree of impairment in functioning due to emotional, behavioral, or psychiatric problems. It is useful for assessing outcomes over time and for directing case management activities. It measures School, Home, Community (delinquent-like behavior), Behavior Toward Others, Mood/Emotions, Self-Harmful Behavior, Substance Use, Thinking Problems, Material Needs, Family/Social Support. Locally the CAFAS is re-administered annually while the client remains in the program. A release from the

parent(s) allows Genesis to share information obtained from the CAFAS with DJJS and DCYF or, the court may allow this information to be shared if the parents refuse.

Further considerations

- Child and Family Services Review 2010 – Push to include Laconia District Office in this process
- Consider implementation of wrap-around services at PDI stage for this target population of youth.
- From the PDI point of processing, determine what data is available (all agencies) and necessary to build case plan.
- Need to develop standards of practice and set questions for getting information from behavioral health and schools (e.g. attendance and behavior in school).
- Include education in this mapping review process.
- Need information from families, the court and the health profession.
- Determine what multi-disciplinary information-sharing protocols exist and apply them uniformly across systems. Develop/implement a protocol where one does not exist. Be cautious of not adding another layer of bureaucracy and oversight where it is not needed.
- Look at outcome measures (what are they now; what should they be?) within and across systems and identify a set of outcomes in DJJS, education, mental health, substance abuse and the like.
 Ex: DJJS – recidivism; DCYF – Safety, permanency and well-being;
 Education – improved school performance; Mental Health – improvements in behavioral functioning.
- Consider the development of a logic model for adopting common goals placing families and children first.

Follow-up activities

- Update DJJS Process Map per Dan (Arrest through Adjudication)
- Consider the development of a medical process map.
- Need to look at early screening processes at diversion level to determine signs for needed services. Track data to determine what screening and assessments detect for needed services and assure easy access to them.
- Examine current protocols and develop a draft protocol which is unique to this population.
- Begin to discuss and define what a structured case coordination model would look like for this population.

Next Meeting

The Steering Committee will discuss the remaining time with John Tuell under the NTTAC and SAG grants and lay out a schedule for accomplishing final tasks associated with this phase of the initiative.