Montgomery County Citizen Review Panel Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, February 9, 2021, 7 pm, via Teams info (bottom of agenda)

Voting:

Kathleen Dunn Laura Coyle Sarah Stanton

Stacey McNeely

Wilma Brier

Non Voting:

Marci McCoy-Roth, Technical Professional

Advisor, 2019-2020 Chair

Laura Brown, Technical Professional Advisor

Kay Farley, Secretary

I. Welcome

Old Business

- II. Review and approve January Minutes
- III. Agency Report
 - A. Overall Program Updates
 - B. Child Welfare Report
 - C. START Program Update
 - D. CJAMS Update (MD Think)
 - E. Family First Implementation
- IV. Committees
 - A. Recruitment and Retention of Resource Families Discussion and next steps
 - a. Discuss the recruitment and retention process, the materials provided by the agency and ideas for improving recruitment and retention processes.
 - b. Postcard idea
 - c. Discover Foster Parenting.org https://discoverfosterparenting.org/
 - d. Resource folder for MC Recruitment Documents
 - e. Recruitment and Retention Toolkit https://docs.google.com/document/d/10nUUzWs6M7XD61JG0LDP4WNR8f0KZ k1FwERowoP2AdY/edit#heading=h.gjdgxs
 - B. Strategic Planning for the Citizen Review Panel
 - a. State Citizens Review Board for Children (CRBC) training for the MCCRP member (Background email from Kay Farley below)
 - b. 2021 Report
 - C. Spring Forum Many Pathways to Wellness Meeting

New Business

- V. None
- VI. Next Meeting: March 9

CALL IN INFORMATION

Click <u>here</u> to join the meeting <u>Click here to join the meeting</u>

Or call in (audio only) +1 443-692-5768,,748977804# United States, Baltimore

| Data Element | Jul-20 | Aug-20 | Sep-20 | Oct-20 | Nov-20 | Dec-20 | Total |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| Assessment | | | | | | | |
| Number of calls to screening | | | | | | 804 | |
| unit | 807 | 783 | 909 | 1014 | 802 | 004 | 5119 |
| Number of New Alternative | | | | | | 54 | |
| Response (AR) Investigations | 37 | 44 | 68 | 77 | 56 | 0.1 | 336 |
| Number of New Investigation | | | | | | 61 | |
| Response (IR) investigations | 54 | 42 | 56 | 69 | 67 | | 349 |
| New Non-CPS | 53 | 72 | 47 | 62 | 48 | 52 | 334 |
| In-Home | | | | | | | |
| Number of Families Receiving | | | | | | | |
| In-Home Services | 97 | 95 | 101 | 105 | 115 | 111 | 104 |
| Out of Home | | | | | | | |
| Number of new out of home | | | | | | | |
| placements (entries) | 17 | 9 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 68 |
| Total children who left care | | | | | | | |
| (exits) | 11 | 11 | 13 | 6 | 13 | 18 | 72 |
| Total out-of-home children in | | | | | | | |
| care at month's end | 438 | 436 | 435 | 441 | 437 | 428 | 436 |
| Number of children in foster | 267 | | | | | | |
| care | 207 | 268 | 261 | 265 | 261 | 255 | 263 |
| Number of children placed | 106 | | | | | | |
| with relatives | | 107 | 114 | 115 | 112 | 110 | 111 |
| Number of Voluntary | | | | | | | |
| Placement Agreements @ | 1 | | | | | | |
| EOM | 0 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 8 |
| Number of Voluntary | | | | | | | |
| Placement Agreement | | | | | | | |
| Requests | 16 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 7 |
| Number of Resource Homes | 212 | 213 | 206 | 208 | 207 | 199 | 208 |
| Average length of stay for | | | | | | | |
| children in foster care | | | | | | | |
| (months) | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29.6 | 30 | 29 |

She provided me with some background information. At one time, every jurisdiction had a Citizens Review Panel (CRP). Montgomery County and Baltimore are now the only jurisdictions with a CRP.

CRBC did provide training when the CRPs were conducting Intensive Case Reviews. These reviews were not out of home placement or foster care reviews like the reviews conducted by the local CRBCs. The CRP Intensive Case Reviews were primarily paper reviews conducted using an agreed (DHS/SSA and CRBC) upon review tool that was adapted from the Child and Family Service Review tool. The reviews could include interviews of workers and interested parties. The purpose of the reviews was to identify areas needing systemic improvements or modifications, assessing policy and practice, compliance, and standards, etc.

The CRPs did not make recommendations on individual cases, send individual case recommendation reports, or identify individual cases in their reporting. The Baltimore City CRP still conducts these case reviews. The Baltimore City CRBC State Board Representative is the Case Review Team Manager and coordinated efforts unless CRBC staff assistance is needed to ensure meeting space, selection of files or any local department follow up.

CRBC staff resources are currently stretched, but the CRBC Administrator offered to explore how CRBC could help with training MCCRP members. She is putting the issue on the agenda for the next CRBC Strategy Committee meeting to consider options. I serve on the Strategy Committee and am the State Board Representative for Montgomery County and Frederick County.

I can keep the MCCRP informed as things move along.

Best,

Kay