



Washington Association
for Children & Families

BRS Division

December 11, 2015; Conference Call

Attendees: Rose Quinby, Ryan Kiely, Jessie Diparto, Dave Kucklick, Mary Johnson, Scott Hanuaer, Linda Thomas, Karen Brady

Agenda Item	Discussion	Decisions
<p>1. Review November BRS Forecasting meeting w/ CWAC & CA Budget Office Staff</p>	<p>Discussed need for developing clear messaging & talking points. Marketing and branding consultants being considered to help develop message strategy.</p> <p>Discussed data need to support Forecasting/Legislative agenda as follows: Percentage of BRS foster care in residential/ in-home, average length of stay, cost per kid.</p> <p>Discussed need for articulating “why” providers are struggling and “what” is the purpose of BRS services. Need to explain differences in providers (residential, in-home etc.)</p>	<p>Rose will contact Doug Allison to request data. <i>DONE however no data has been sent. Action includes request plus two follow ups.</i></p> <p>Ad Hoc committee formed to work on developing the qualitative message around “why” providers are struggling. Committee consists of Ryan, Linda, Jessie, and Dave.</p>

<p>2. Clarification of use of ECPs; therapeutic BRS vs. traditional foster care with ECP</p>	<p>Question posed: Are ECP's being used appropriately? Members discussed BRS placements are being used quickly to return kids to therapeutic foster care-impact could be increased ECP usage.</p>	
<p>3. Residential gaps - so we can avoid youth being sent out of state</p>	<p>Discussed believes around whether acuity of needs or lack of available homes (or combination of two) is impacting out of state placements.</p> <p>Complexity of the system of care discussed, related to provider pressure to accept highly acute referrals, which increases risk. The term "cherry picking" was discussed and defined. Members discussed belief that a decline in referral may be looked at as "cherry picking", meaning only willing to accept less complicated or acute referrals.</p> <p>DLF/CPS thought to be contributing to a climate that discourages providers for taking youth with complex needs by at times "blaming the provider" by finding licensing violations, when the youth displays high risk behaviors. Providers have a disincentive for taking youth with higher behavior and emotional needs thus contributing to out-of-state place.</p> <p>Additionally- new CPS intake process was indicated as generating referrals for common behavior issues (ex. Running etc.)</p>	<p>Characteristics of youth being placed out-of-state: Developmental needs, trauma, violence, sexually reactive, & multiple failed placements.</p> <p>Increase ability to discuss to relevant stakeholders the complexity and pressures providers face. Members will continue to look for ways to link secure funding source to outcomes of risk prevention, decrease lawsuits, & workforce stability.</p>

<p>4. Other- Cenpatico</p>	<p>Brief discussion about impact of Cenpatico statewide contract on BRS youth placed in therapeutic foster care.</p>	<p>Impact of insurance change for foster care relevant only to members who have a primary health care linkages or agency mental health provider license. Will discuss in future if necessary.</p>
<p>5. Agenda for Next Meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency in implementing best practices • Workforce development and stabilization • Forecasting legislative agenda 	<p>Date will be forthcoming. Thanks everyone!</p>