

***Tennessee Citizen Review Panels
Annual Report***

June 2007

PREPARED FOR

The Tennessee Department of Children's Services



**THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND PUBLIC SERVICE**

***Tennessee Citizen Review Panels
Annual Report***

June 2007

PREPARED FOR

The Tennessee Department of Children's Services

BY

SUSAN STEPPE, MSSW



**THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND PUBLIC SERVICE**

***The University of Tennessee
College of Social Work
Office of Research and Public Service***

KAREN SOWERS, DEAN

PAUL CAMPBELL, DIRECTOR

The University of Tennessee does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, color, religion, national origin, age, disability or veteran status in provision of educational programs and services or employment opportunities and benefits. This policy extends to both employment by and admission to the University.

The University does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, or disability in its education programs and activities pursuant to the requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990.

Inquiries and charges of violation concerning Title VI, Title IX, Section 504, ADA or the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) or any of the other above referenced policies should be directed to the Office of Equity and Diversity (OED), 1840 Melrose Avenue, Knoxville, TN 37996-3560, telephone (865) 974-2498 (V/TTY available) or 974-2440. Requests for accommodation of a disability should be directed to the ADA Coordinator at the UTK Office of Human Resources, 600 Henley Street, Knoxville, TN 37996-4125.

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in its efforts to ensure a welcoming environment for all persons, does not discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation in its campus-based programs, services, and activities. Inquiries and complaints should be directed to the Office of Equity and Diversity.

Project # 07058

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Tennessee’s Citizen Review Panels	3
Location	3
Member Selection	4
CRP Activities for 2006–07	5
Meeting with Commissioner Miller	6
In Pursuit of the File Reading Option	6
Montgomery County Activities	8
Shelby County Activities	10
Northwest Region Activities	11
Co-Chairs Attend Joint Meeting in Atlanta	12
Recommendations from Citizen Review Panels	13
Conclusion	14
Appendix A: Citizen Review Panel Members	15
Montgomery County Citizen Review Panel Membership	16
Shelby County Citizen Review Panel Membership	17
Northwest Region Citizen Review Panel Membership	18
Appendix B: Statewide CRP Conference Materials	19
Persons Attending the Statewide Annual CRP Conference	22
Notes from the Supervisory Meeting of the NW Focus Group	23
Northwest TN Focus Group Information—Case Manager Meeting	25

Introduction

The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) requires states that receive funding through this legislation to comply with specific requirements related to developing and maintaining a system to respond to child maltreatment. In 1996, CAPTA was amended to include a provision that states must establish Citizen Review Panels (CRPs) as part of their required activities in order to receive funding. The following excerpt was taken from *Citizen Review Panels for the Child Protective System: Guidelines and Policy* by Veronika Kot, Charles Bruner, and Stephen Scott. This publication was produced in 1998 (updated in 2001) by the Child and Family Policy Center in Des Moines, Iowa, for Prevent Child Abuse America through a program funded by the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation:

The statute defines the functions of the Citizen Review Panels broadly and generally. The Panels must meet at least quarterly and must produce an annual, public report of their activities. They must examine the policies, procedures, and where appropriate, specific cases handled by state as well as local child protective service (CPS) agencies. The purpose of this citizen review is to determine whether state and local agencies are effectively discharging their child protection responsibilities. The Panels are instructed to measure agency performance by determining whether the agency complies with

- 1. The state CAPTA plan, including the state's assurances of compliance with federal requirements contained in the plan;*
- 2. The extent of the agency's coordination with the Title IV-E foster care and adoption systems and the review process for child fatalities and near fatalities; and*

3. *Any other criteria which the Panels consider important.*

Two specific aspects of this law have posed challenges for Tennessee's panels since their inception. First, the law suggests an oversight function, indicating that panels would turn a critical eye to the child welfare system and hold it accountable for actions and outcomes related to specific children. The difficulty in this charge is that review panel members are community partners of the local child welfare agency, and while they may experience some or a great deal of frustration with the system, they do not feel comfortable in the role of judging and criticizing local practice. This is due to the reality that, ultimately, at the end of any critical exercise, these same partners need to resume a working relationship with the child welfare players.

The second challenge is that the mandate is so broadly defined, it does not give a clear sense of direction. According to CAPTA, CRPs may identify any issue that concerns them and conduct many different types of activities to explore the issue. While the broadly stated mandate gives much freedom, it does not provide any information to help structure the CRPs' inquiry into issues. Left without that structure, panel members must explore the options and reach consensus on what to pursue and how to pursue it, all the while being concerned about the awkward position of criticizing the system.

Tennessee's panels have grappled with these issues from the beginning and have continued to do so in the past year. Nevertheless, the panels have made progress in identifying key issues and trying to gather information on those issues. This report details their activities for the past year and their efforts to move forward in fulfilling the purpose for which they were developed.

Tennessee's Citizen Review Panels

Location

Tennessee has three CRPs located in Montgomery County (Clarksville), Memphis, and the Northwest Region of Tennessee (including nine rural counties). The University of Tennessee College of Social Work Office of Research and Public Service (SWORPS) contracts with the Tennessee Department of Children's Services (TDCS) to coordinate, facilitate, and provide technical assistance to the CRPs in order to meet the federal requirements.

The Montgomery County CRP is located in Clarksville, Tennessee, a city that has a large military base within the city limits and borders the state of Kentucky. The unique population of military personnel, both active and retired, and the ethnic diversity and transient patterns in the population represent unique challenges in child protection. The TDCS in Clarksville investigates a large number of military personnel who are living great distances from extended family and support systems. Many of the soldiers and their families are quite young and are struggling with new relationships and stresses associated with deployment. CPS staff members face the challenge of conducting CPS investigations within the context of the military base and its imposing structure.

The CRP in Memphis, Tennessee, the largest urban area in Tennessee, was chosen to reflect issues specific to urban and inner-city areas. TDCS offices in this area of the state suffer from frequent staff turnover and higher than average caseloads. Memphis has the highest caseload of TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) families in Tennessee, a factor that contributes to family stress and issues that bring children and families to the attention of TDCS.

The Northwest Region of Tennessee was chosen to have a CRP because it serves a rural population in a relatively large geographical area. While the TDCS staff in this region is stable and turnover is minimal, there are very limited resources to offer to families or to assist TDCS in its efforts to reduce risk and provide safety to children and families. Providing CPS in this sparsely populated area poses special challenges in reaching isolated families who cannot easily access resources.

TDCS has contracted with SWORPS to work with the TDCS office in Knoxville, Knox County, Tennessee, to develop a Citizen Review Panel in that area. To date, there has been an initial meeting with TDCS leadership in Knox County and a discussion of how a proposed CRP can complement or enhance the county's efforts to implement the Multiple Response System (MRS) model. That model requires each county to develop a Citizens Advisory Board to support the service delivery process. TDCS staff persons are working to coordinate these two efforts.

Member Selection

Each CRP has a Tennessee Department of Children's Services liaison who serves as an advisor to the panel on various policies and procedures of the department. CRP members were selected for the panel by the local region. Membership was based on the specific guidelines included in the *Citizens Review Panels for the Child Protective Services System Guidelines and Protocols*. All three existing panels have strong representation from local school systems, child advocacy centers, and local child advocates.

CRP Activities for 2006–2007

When Citizen Review Panel members met on April 6, 2006, in Jackson, Tennessee, they considered the role of CRPs and ways to explore issues in the child welfare system in order to develop recommendations. At that time there was a group consensus to pursue the issue of follow-up and prevention services, both across the state and, specifically, in the communities served by the three CRPs. The following statewide focus was established in this meeting:

CRP Statewide Focus established on April 6, 2006: We want children and families to receive recommended follow-up services. Toward that end, we will focus on these questions:

- ◆ *Are clients' needs accurately assessed?*
- ◆ *Are relevant resources available in our communities?*
- ◆ *Are the services meeting the needs of the clients? (quality)*
- ◆ *What are the barriers to clients receiving recommended services?*
- ◆ *How effective are the services?*

The National Resource Center on Child Protective Services Consultant, Pam Bond, presented to the group a variety of options for exploring the issue. It was clear that in order to make meaningful recommendations on the issue of services to families, the CRP members had to find some way to learn about the current “state of the community” with regard to this issue. This presented questions such as:

- ◆ *What are the most common presenting issues/needs of families in our community?*

- ◆ What are the characteristics of families referred to CPS for intervention?
- ◆ What about families inappropriately referred to CPS? What are the needs of those families and how can we meet those needs?
- ◆ What types of community services are available?
- ◆ Are the services effective? Are they relevant to the needs of the clients?
- ◆ What are our options in developing services that are relevant and effective?

In order to address these issues, the CRPs needed information about client families and local service delivery systems. In the quest for that information all three CRPs began with the idea of reviewing TDCS files. Certainly, the federal legislation gives them the right to do so, and it was proposed that this strategy would be the best way to get a handle on the “state of the community” with regard to services and needs.

Meeting with Commissioner Miller

CRP chairs first discussed a possible review of TDCS files with Commissioner Miller on August 17, 2006, and she suggested that the committee members might want to participate in the TDCS Quality Services Review process. Commissioner Miller recommended that the chairs talk with Daryl Chansuthus who directs this effort for TDCS. After a conference call with Ms. Chansuthus in late August 2006, the co-chairs conferred on a call and agreed that the departmental QSR effort was likely beyond the scope of CRP members’ available time and was not geared toward obtaining information in the specific area that the CRPs had identified.

In Pursuit of the File Reading Option

Since obtaining information through the QSR process did not seem practical, CRP chairs moved to meet with the local Regional Administrators to develop a mutually acceptable evaluation strategy. In fall 2006, the chairpersons and Susan Steppe met with Kitty Oliver (September 14, 2006), Frank Mix (September 18, 2006 and December 4, 2006), and Antionette Holman (September 28, 2006) on this issue. The key questions in each session were: How can we gather information about local service delivery? Should we read TDCS case files? Ultimately, it became clear that reading TDCS files was

not the best way to meet the information needs of CRPs for the following reasons:

- ◆ In order to get a broad view of the situation, the CRPs would need to randomly pull a sample large enough to draw general conclusions on the findings. Reading a large sample meant developing an instrument and achieving inter-rater reliability, time-consuming tasks.
- ◆ CRP members are unaccustomed to looking at TDCS files. There would have been a learning curve to become familiar with formats and to find information.
- ◆ TDCS staff members are frequently in the position of having their files pulled and read by a variety of people. There was concern that the act of reviewing files, in and of itself, would create an adversarial tone between TDCS staff and the community partners in the CRP.

In summary, the file reading option required more time than CRP members could reasonably give the process; there was concern about the reliability of the findings; and the file reading process would likely create tension and an adversarial relationship with TDCS.

After reaching this point of understanding, each CRP began to deal with the task of learning more about service delivery in a different way.

Note on: Multiple Response System— A continuing theme in all CRP discussions was each region's implementation of the Multiple Response System. The CRPs' interests in service delivery certainly overlap with the advent of MRS implementation in every region. The MRS implementation process requires each county to have a Community Advisory Board (CAB) to support the local implementation. One of the issues that poses a challenge to the CRP process is how the role of the CAB is different or similar to the role of the Citizens Review Panel. Could one group or body meet both of these roles? Clearly, gathering, maintaining, and nurturing one community group is a significant task. Maintaining two groups with similar functions and many of the same people is impractical. In response to this issue, the Northwest CRP decided that it could not serve as the CAB for any one county, because CRP members came from all nine counties. In that region, CRP has a clearly different function from the CAB. Shelby County and Clarksville have not fully resolved this question. The upcoming Knox County CRP may very well attempt to combine these two functions.

Montgomery County Activities

This panel met a total of eight times in this fiscal year on the following dates:

8-7-06—In this meeting the CRP discussed the possible review of records and data that should be gathered in the file review. They looked for more direction on this in the upcoming meeting with Commissioner Miller on 8-17-06.

9-18-06—Met with Regional Administrator Frank Mix. CRP decided to conduct a focus group, then individual interviews with TDCS staff persons to learn more about the service delivery process.

9-29-06—The group talked about expanding membership and attempting to achieve more diversity in membership. They cancelled plans to conduct a focus group with case managers and opted to plan a group discussion with Child Protective Services and Family Support Services (FSS) supervisors. The TDCS representative was unable to attend on this date so dates for the focus group were posed but not confirmed.

10-26-06—At this meeting CRP members began talking about conducting a TDCS focus group but learned from their TDCS representative that the county would soon be implementing the Multiple Response System, a new way to serve families. The group decided that a focus group discussion on prevention services on the cusp of major organizational change in this area would be difficult. They opted to learn more about MRS and conduct a focus group with school personnel.

11-13-06—Conducted a focus group with area school guidance counselors. The major issues that emerged were central intake and general miscommunication or failure to communicate between TDCS and school personnel.

12-4-06—The group met with Regional Administrator Frank Mix and two team coordinators. Since the region was in the process of gathering data and information to implement MRS, the group decided to meet again in February, when TDCS staff would present a few case situations that would illustrate typical families needing services and challenges in providing those services. The February meeting had to be rescheduled.

3-12-07—TDCS staff did not bring case information to this meeting, but there was general discussion about current challenges in the TDCS/FSS system and how the Multiple Response System would change this. The panel members want to embrace and support implementation of MRS in Montgomery County. The next step was for all members to meet again in Jackson at the annual meeting and regroup to decide how the CRP could

further explore the issues and challenges of service delivery in Montgomery County.

4-12-07 at the Statewide Conference—Montgomery County members developed these next steps:

- ◆ Conduct a focus group with Family Support Staff and CPS supervisors. They would like to pose these questions: What resources would make your job better? What services are available for families? What could help meet the clients' needs?
- ◆ Obtain data on the CPS and FSS programs of Montgomery County. They want to know things such as
 - How many referrals are reported by referral type?
 - How many referrals by referral source?
 - How many referrals by referral source, by classification?
 - How many families are referred for FSS?
 - How many of those families are accepted by FSS?
 - What types of services do FSS clients get?
 - What are outcomes for FSS clients? Do they remain at home, have subsequent referrals, get removed anyway?

Shelby County Activities

The Shelby County CRP met a total of five times.

7-12-06—This meeting was held at the TDCS office. The initial focus of the Shelby CRP was on the process of assessing child and family needs.

Members heard presentations by TDCS staff on their initiatives in the area of implementing Functional Assessment, Structured Decision-Making, and Child and Family Team Meetings.

8-14-06—Members gathered at the Memphis City Schools Bond Building. They discussed ways to promote the use of the computer-based training that the group had worked on in the previous year. They also developed a plan to conduct a review of TDCS cases in October after the Chairperson, Sandra Allen, had met with the local Regional Administrator.

9-28-06—Sandra Allen and Susan Steppe met with Antionette Holman, TDCS Regional Administrator, to discuss the possibility of a file review. It was recommended that the CRP pursue focus groups instead.

After this meeting, TDCS experienced a change in local TDCS leadership when Ms. Holman left her post. The panel did not pursue this issue further until the next meeting in 2007.

3-7-07—At that time the CRP reviewed some Shelby County TDCS data that had been provided by the TDCS Public Information staff in fall 2006. This data had been made available for use in the proposed media campaign to publicize the computer-based training on child abuse reporting. The committee members agreed that review of data might be a better way to pursue the exploration of the services issue.

4-12-07—The Shelby County group agreed with others that the ability to review and analyze local data was an important first step for them. This step could perhaps lead to more inquiry and other efforts including focus groups. They felt that the data analysis could help shape their inquiry.

Northwest Region Activities

The Northwest CRP conducted the following activities:

6-13-06—This meeting actually occurred in the previous fiscal year, but was intended to launch the inquiry into service delivery, the focus of fiscal year 2007. The committee heard a presentation about the region's many efforts to implement the Multiple Response System and decided to review cases in which families had received an alternate response.

8-15-06—This group met in Dyer County. They heard an update of MRS implementation and decided to review two types of cases: 1) families who had been served through the MRS, and 2) families who had not been part of the MRS. The group discussed a strategy for reviewing cases and drafted a review instrument. They set two dates for their reviews: One date to review pre-MRS cases and a meeting date in October to look at families in the MRS.

9-14-06—Co-chair Marilyn Goodman and Susan Steppe met with Kitty Oliver in Dresden to discuss the proposed case review process. It was decided in this meeting that case review was not the best way to explore the information since the MRS system was so new. Rather, the group considered another option to conduct individual interviews with case managers. CRP members would form three teams in three different geographical areas to conduct these interviews. (This idea migrated to the Clarksville CRP and was discussed as a strong possibility there.)

10-2-06—Co-chairs Dana Cobb and Marilyn Goodman had a conference call with Susan Steppe in regard to the draft plan developed with Kitty Oliver. The chairs preferred a different, more positive approach, and they developed the idea to hold focus groups through a Staff Appreciation Day at the end of October. Kitty Oliver concurred and the date was set for October 30, 2006.

10-30-06—CRP hosted the Appreciation Day/Focus Group for all Northwest Region CPS staff.

3-21-07—CRP met in Martin to revisit findings of the focus group and discuss possible recommendations from the CRP. Members decided to present their focus group experience at the Annual Meeting.

4-12-07—Members gathered in Jackson. Co-chairs presented findings from the focus group to the statewide group. The following are the proposed future steps for this CRP:

- ◆ Will conduct the focus groups every year as an annual event
- ◆ Would like to access and review data similar to that described above in the Montgomery County comments

- ◆ Suggest that TDCS designate a training resource person for each county.
- ◆ Would like to further evaluate the mobile crisis support efforts for mental health crises. This was a major issue in the focus group.

Co-Chairs Attend Joint Meeting in Atlanta

In addition to the above activities, CRP Chairpersons Judy Covington (Clarksville), Maria Carrier (Clarksville), Sandra Allen (Memphis), and Dana Cobb (Northwest) attended the Region IV joint meeting of child abuse prevention professionals and citizens review panel members in Atlanta, Georgia, on December 6–8, 2006. Susan Steppe and Rory Alley of SWORPS also attended this meeting.

Recommendations from Citizen Review Panels

Concern: Community Partners are often uninformed or poorly informed about the many TDCS initiatives. This creates confusion and reduces efforts for CRP members to understand and support TDCS's efforts.

Recommendation 1: Publish a monthly or quarterly electronic newsletter specifically targeted for providers and partners **outside** of TDCS. The purpose of this communication is to bridge the gap in information and encourage support for these efforts.

Concern: CRPs need access to TDCS data that helps describe the current service delivery system. The CRPs need help to access relevant reports.

Recommendation 2: Please designate a person who can help CRPs identify critical data elements and obtain reports for review and analysis. Make data available as requested through consultation with the contact person.

Conclusion

Tennessee's Citizens Review Panels will continue to look at the issue of service delivery and Multiple Response System implementation in the coming year. The efforts in fiscal year 2007 have been frustrating in one sense because there was slow progress in learning more about the topic area and understanding clients' needs. However, these efforts have resulted in a sense of direction that appears to be more practical for the panels as they work in partnership with the Department of Children's Services. The panels take pride in the fact that 2007 is the first year since the inception of Tennessee's Citizen Review Panels that these groups have made formal recommendations to the Commissioner. While the recommendations do not relate directly to service delivery, they can pave the way to make information available for productive work in the year to come.

Appendix A

Citizen Review Panel Members

Montgomery County Citizen Review Panel Membership

Debra Bucy, Guidance Counselor, Clarksville-Montgomery County Schools

Maria Carrier, LCSW, Blanchfield Army Community Hospital, Co-chair

Judy Covington, Executive Director, Montgomery County Child Advocacy Center, Co-chair

Susan Jones, Professional Development Coordinator, Clarksville-Montgomery County Schools

Kathy Martin, Nursing Instructor

Mayme Stephenson, Training Consortium, Austin-Peay State University

Amelia Wallace, Team Coordinator, Tennessee Department of Children's Services

Sandra Smith-Williams, Montgomery County Juvenile Court

Shelby County Citizen Review Panel Membership

Sandra Allen, Executive Director, LeBonheur Center for Children and Parents, Chair

Jeanette Boyd, CPS Team Coordinator, Shelby County DCS

Joree Brownlow, Attorney

Daphni Ishak, Court Appointed Special Advocate Program

Jean McIvor, Lowenburg School of Nursing

Dr. Randy Schnell, Coordinator of Mental Health Services, Memphis City Schools

Katie Stanton, Shelby County Board of Education

Dr. Patricia Toarmina, Director, Division of Exceptional Children and Health Services, Memphis City Schools

Dr. Gregory Washington, The University of Tennessee College of Social Work

Nancy Williams, Executive Director, Memphis Child Advocacy Center

Northwest Region Citizen Review Panel Membership

Dana Cobb, Tennessee Commission on Children and Youth, Northwest Area Manager, Co-chair

Marilyn Goodman, School Social Worker, Milan High School, Co-chair

Chanesia Dixon, Northwest Tennessee Head Start Program

Ron Green, Executive Director, Boys Club and Girls Club of Northwest Tennessee

Ann Minton, Day Care Licensing

Ellarine Moses, Retired Guidance Counselor

Martha Smith, Henry County Schools

Sharon Wenz, The University of Tennessee at Martin

Joetta Yarbrow, Northwest Tennessee Family Resource Center, Dyer County Schools

Appendix B

Statewide CRP Conference Materials

April 12, 2007

Tennessee Citizens Review Panel

Annual Statewide Meeting

Agenda

9:30	<p>Welcome and Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Mascots • Little known facts about you 	Chairs, Susan Steppe, and Rory Alley
10:00	<p>Quick Review of the Mission of CRPs</p> <p>Review of Last Year's Meeting and Annual Plan</p>	Susan Steppe
10:30	<p>Purpose Today's Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop Recommendations on Prevention/Follow-up Services for Commissioner Miller • Establish a common area for next year 	Chairs and Susan Steppe
10:45	Break	
11:00	<p>The Northwest Experience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Goal: Gather information about the provision of follow up/prevention services • The Method: Appreciation Day and Focus Groups • The Feedback: Information on Staff perception of client needs and service availability • The next step: Develop a recommendation 	Dana Cobb and Marilyn Goodman
11:45	Break to Get Lunch	
12:15	<p>Groups continue lunch in CRP local groups</p> <p>Questions to Focus Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where are we? What have we learned in the last year? • What types of data or information have we been able to consider? • If we haven't considered any new information, what recommendations can 	

	<p>we make to the Commissioner that would allow us to consider information?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are recommendations we can make as a group?• What do we want to focus on next year?	
1:15	Report Back and Clarify	Chairs
2:00	Consensus on Recommendations and New Direction	Chairs
2:30	Thanks and Goodbye	

Persons Attending the Statewide Annual CRP Conference

Northwest CRP:

Dana Cobb, Co-Chair, NW Area Manager, TCCY

Chanesia Dixon, NW Head Start Program

Marilyn Goodman, Co-Chair, Social Worker, Milan Special School District

Shannon Mayo, Resource Coordinator, TDCS

Ann Minton, Child Care Program, Department of Human Services

Phyllis Webb, Team Coordinator, TDCS

Joetta Yarbro, Dyer City Schools

Shelby County CRP

Sandra Allen, Chair, Le Bonheur Center for Children and Parents

Jeanette Boyd, Team Coordinator, TDCS

Marvin Chaney, Assistant Regional Administrator, TDCS, Shelby County

Randy Schnell, Memphis City Schools

Nancy Williams, Memphis Child Advocacy Center

Montgomery County CRP

Maria Carrier, Co-Chair, Fort Campbell, Family Advocacy Program

Judy Covington, Co-Chair, Montgomery County Child Advocacy Center

Debra Bucy, Guidance Counselor, Clarksville-Montgomery County Schools

Marjahna Hart, TDCS, Central Office

Mayme Stephenson, Consortium Trainer, Austin-Peay State University

Susan Steppe and Rory Alley, SWORPS

Amelia B. Wallace, Team Coordinator, TDCS

Sandra Smith-Williams, Montgomery County Juvenile Court

Future CRP meeting dates: Northwest—August 22, time and location to be determined; Shelby County—June 12 at 8:30 AM, location to be determined; and Clarksville—June 24, 2:30 PM, location to be determined.

Notes from the Supervisory Meeting of the Northwest Region Focus Group

October 30, 2006

Common issues

- ◆ Poverty
- ◆ Housing crises
- ◆ Multiple problem families with many things co-occurring
- ◆ Crisis ridden families who are poor, fall deeper into debt, cannot pay bills, often lose their housing and are typically just unstable
- ◆ Cannot plan ahead for the future—unable to get ahead

GAPS in services

Effective and available Drug/Alcohol Rehabilitation Services

Transportation to services

Emergency Housing—when folks have lost their homes due to inability to pay rent or uninhabitable places

Posed This Question: How did we survive as adults? What helped us be successful?

Discussion about the old style “homemakers” that TDHS (then the child welfare agency) used to employ. They were teaching homemakers, not meant to clean up a home but to teach and model.

What do we really need to help clients? One idea:

- ◆ Therapeutic Homemakers or perhaps Life Skills Coaches? Para-professionals who engage the client in a relationship provide support and advice on daily challenges. Provide support to them in issues surrounding their children, specifically, effective discipline, playing/reading with children, how to help children be more successful in school (success—means attend regularly, participate, arrive with the right clothes and properly fed, etc.).
- ◆ Frustration with current purchased services. Agencies hire young, inexperienced people and offer a “treatment” service that may or may not connect with the client. The service is provided weekly but does not appear to produce the desired outcomes for clients.

Discussion of Community Partners:

What is the role of Community Partners? In Union City they have a model Emergency Housing program that is developed and maintained by a local church. Could this concept be spread to other areas?

Since the MRS requires local advisory committees, could we share this idea with each one and ask these local committees to aid in the development of services like these?

NOTE: Bright Horizons was not discussed in this event but was mentioned as a model worth expanding in the CRP meeting on March 22, 2007, in Martin.

Some important points to consider for recommendations:

How are current resource dollars spent? Does the NW DCC program want to re-think and re-tool? If these services are not hitting the mark, can we develop some that are?

Development of Collaborations—Could we engage the community through the MRS community groups to help us combat some of these problems?

Northwest TN Focus Group Information— Case Manager Meeting

Typical Behavioral Issues of Parents

- ◆ Drug use of parents
- ◆ Parents not providing for kids' basic needs like meds and education
- ◆ Lack of parenting skills
- ◆ Mental health issues

Behavioral Issues of Children

- ◆ Mental Health Issues
- ◆ Unruly Children

Barriers and Service Needs

- ◆ Parents have no transportation.
- ◆ Parents have no jobs.
- ◆ TennCare will not pay for offender treatment without court intervention.
- ◆ Statewide programs are not locally available—few or no choices in vendors of services—dissatisfaction with the “products” that some vendors provide.
- ◆ Need more relevant services—more intensive services provided in the home.
- ◆ Need more long-term inpatient services for children and parents.
- ◆ Need qualified clinicians on TDCS staff to aid the casework process.