

**Nevada Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS)  
Differential Response Steering Committee Meeting  
4126 Technology Way, Carson City, NV, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Video Conference Room  
November 1, 2017**

**FINAL Minutes**

**Videoconference Locations**

4126 Technology Way, Carson City, NV  
6171 W Charleston Bldg. 8, Conference Room B, Las Vegas  
1010 Ruby Vista Drive #101, Elko

**Attendees**

Carson

John Bryant, Washoe County Social Services  
Joyce Buckingham, Ron Wood Center  
Kristin Monibi, Washoe County  
Lori Smith, DCFS  
Patrick White, Children's Cabinet  
Rechelle Murillo, Washoe County School District  
Wylie Evanson, Washoe County School District  
Bruce Cole, DCFS, recorder

Las Vegas

Alma Spears, Boys & Girls Clubs of Southern Nevada  
Debbie Croshaw, Clark County Family Services  
Hayley Jarolimek, DCFS  
Holly Vetter, DCFS  
Jessica McGee, East Valley Family Services  
Kristin Aviles, Hope Link  
Laura Steeps, Olive Crest

Call In

Amber Cummins, Washoe County  
Anna Coons, Lyon County  
Dena Corritore, Washoe County

**I. Call to Order, Welcome, Introductions**

Hayley Jarolimek called the meeting to order at 9:07 and the roll was called.

**II. Public Comment**

None.

### **III. For Possible Action: Approval of May 3, 2017 Meeting Minutes**

Patrick moved the minutes be approved. Laura seconded. Minutes approved.

### **IV. For Possible Action: Monthly Reports/Data Collection Requirements**

Hayley said there are two reports. The first was for the first quarter of FY 2017-2018. The second was for the entire FY 2016-2017. There were no questions.

### **V. For Possible Action: Child and Family Services Review Round 3 Overview**

Lori Smith was introduced by Hayley to report on this for the State, with Dena and Holly being the leads for CFSR in Washoe and Clark, respectively.

Lori noted that Jan Fragale, Social Services Chief in the Family Programs Office of DCFS would normally be doing this, but was out of the office today. She first gave something of the history of the CFSR process. The first round of reviews were from 2001-04 in all states and the District of Columbia. No-one met all criteria, so each had to implement a Program Improvement Program (PIP) for specific areas. From 2004 to 2007 and then 2007 to 2010, two rounds of reviews were held. Again, no-one passed all the requirements. The third round, which is going on now, began in 2015 and will last until 2018. Nevada's will be next year. Major components are: the state's self-assessment, case record reviews, a final report of the review's findings, and a Program Improvement Plan. Lori developed a "DR Case Review Preparation Check List" for this meeting to show DR agencies (as stakeholders) what reviewers will be looking for in the Differential Response part of the review. The review's 'window' is from April 1, 2017 onwards. She stressed that this is from a reviewer's and case worker's perspective; documentation is a very important.

Hayley confirmed, in answer to Anna Coons, that case notes entered in UNITY are sufficient documentation. She then asked Lori to go over why DR is now included in the CFSR, as it has not been in the past. Lori said that 5 DR cases will be in the review (1 Clark, 1 Washoe, 3 in the Rurals) but did not know the historical background for DR's inclusion. Holly said that DR is now viewed as a specific Program Area. She said reviewers may well call and interview DR workers on specific cases.

Lori went back to the Check List, highlighting reviewers' emphasis on safety, permanency, and well-being. It is a guide for DR supervisors and workers. She went over the guidelines on assessments, safety outcome, case planning, and well-being outcome. Hayley asked what the various DR agencies use for case planning. What is the documentation, and are families given anything? Patrick said that typically families are not given the plan drawn up for them. Anna said their plan – goals for the family - is signed by the family, but not given to them. Joyce said their procedure is similar to what Patrick outlined for Children's Cabinet. Hayley asked if there is a reason why families are not given a copy. There isn't – Patrick said these get written up at the family home, and with the family, as a working document. They could, when finalized, give it to the family the next day. Joyce agreed. Hayley said that from now on families should be given a copy from now on. Holly added that from a reviewers' perspective, this should be part of the case planning.

Lori continued with the Well-Being Outcome on the Check List. Hayley asked about in-home vs. out-of-home cases. Lori said there is a distinction – out-of-home has the various components (education,

medical, mental health) covered, whereas in-home specifics of the situation are screened in for why the agency is involved, and whether the components are appropriate to the case. Lori said this is determined by the assessment of the case, which was confirmed by Holly. She added that problems can arise during a case, which might add new components. Lori then talked about the last part of the Check List, the Case Summary Note. This is helpful tool, which DR should add, so there is a clear record of why CPS had DR get involved, what services were provided, what succeeded and what did not. This is done both at the beginning and end of the case.

John Bryant asked about the Well-Being section. Should there be a record of attempts to get parent's release of information? Lori said, yes, and with follow up as to who was contacted, etc. during the life of the case.

Joyce asked about case plans be given to families. Her concern is whether signatures by the family merely indicates that they have been informed or that they agree to the services being offered. Hayley said this is about the family agreeing to the plan; she thinks families historically don't have a problem with that. She added that the same tool should be used by all DR agencies. Hayley asked that the various DR actors send their current tools to Bruce; perhaps a work group could then go forward on this issue. Hayley said that this will be part of the policy review that is going on. Jennifer Dominguez will be working on these policies and will get back to everyone.

Hayley had sent a handout before the meeting. This deals with a conflict between the State's Worker Policy and DR Policy on being unable to locate family members during a case. Families have a choice not to meet with DR; if they don't the case would go back to CPS. However, cases have been closed. Patrick wondered what they should do when they have made repeated efforts. Hayley thinks that DR should follow that same "persistent effort" standard that is in the Worker Policy. Patrick said that, for example, several trips will be made to a school to contact a child, but they will not have a release of information authorization, which makes it a "no go." Holly said there may be confusion between not being able to find family members and a family refusing services. Hayley said that if DR were to use "persistent effort" then CPS could work with, say, school districts. There must be more than minimal effort made, and this can be made into a consistent policy. Anna talked about situations when family refuses services after initial visit – would this then kick back to CPS? Hayley said it depended on initial assessment. DR should consult with CPS partner. Lori wondered if she and Jennifer should generate an initial draft of policy on this or if a working group would do it. Hayley said it would be her preference if they made that draft.

John Bryant suggested that DR can contact the Washoe Schools, which can use their Infinite Campus system and their diligent search team. Both Patrick and Joyce confirmed they do that, but Patrick reiterated that some schools want a lot of documentation and others are very lenient about DR contacting children in the schools. Hayley said that in Las Vegas the school district is contacted by DFS to conduct a search. Lori added that from a reviewer's perspective the record should say 'referred back to CPS' rather than 'case closed' when this happens. Hayley agreed, and said that until policy is changed DR should note in UNITY that case was "referred back to CPS" and not that they closed case. In Clark, DR workers can reach out to teachers or other school employees if they are the 'source' who initiated the report (otherwise, they cannot). Joyce and Patrick said that is not the way they have done it. Anna confirmed this, too.

Hayley conclude that for now, until policy is amended, CPS will make the decision about the case status, and she will inform DCFS Rural Regions about this.

Lori asked if there are any other areas to highlight regarding DR policy. Hayley said that Ida Drury's report of last year was very useful in identifying weaknesses and that Washoe County also did a good report on their cases. Kristin Monibi said that report concentrated on the question of the preferred mode of initial contact – phone call vs. unannounced visit. Hayley said that question should go into Lori's DR policy work and that the different practices around the state will have to be addressed eventually. This also ties in with UNITY issues – if there are problems in reporting of cases, DR people should go to their CPS partner and inform them of the problems.

#### **VI. Discussion Item: Program Updates**

Anna said they are now fully staffed. There are two new hires, who have attended CORE. One still needs access to UNTIY. Referrals are high right now.

Joyce said they have 23 cases in Douglas and Carson, 10 in Elko, and their Winnemucca worker has her first case. The Elko worker just finished CORE.

Patrick said they are interviewing now for one position. Currently there are 23 cases split between two workers. The Director of Operation resigned, and they are looking for her replacement.

Rochelle is new to the group. Mike Mouljian retired in August, and Wiley Evanson has replaced him. His position is now open.

Wiley said they have 14 cases currently. He went to a DR conference in Colorado recently, which was very good – California is implementing the same model as Nevada and he will share more about that in future meetings.

John said Jeanne Marsh has retired and been replaced by Ryan Gustafson. There is also a training unit supervisor now. Kristen Monibi said that a new 1-800 number is being implemented after the new year.

Kristin Aviles said they have one resignation, and one new person.

Jessica said they have currently just one worker, and are not taking on new cases. The assistant supervisor will go on maternity leave in February.

Laura said they have 22 cases with two workers. They are also seeing the educational neglect cases starting to come in.

Alma said they have two and a half workers, with 12 cases.

Hayley said there is provider in Pahrump, named Katie, who will need CORE training. Patrick, Joyce, Kristen Aviles and Wiley all have workers who also need CORE. Hayley will find out when the next training occurs. She added that it would be ideal to have some trainings via webinar.

Kristin Monibi asked Dena about the child contact case notes training – could DR be included in that? Dena said yes. Kristen said she would get the information. Dena said she would send the PowerPoint on it to Hayley; it is about 40 minutes long. Hayley wonder if this could be done with GoToMeeting. Dena thought it could. Debbie requested that this be a mandatory training for DR workers and supervisors. Hayley said they would move on this soon.

### **VII. Public Comment**

Bruce said that he will lock in the phone numbers and room for February 7, May 2, August 1, and November 7 for the meeting in 2018.

### **VIII. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:43.