

Tennessee Citizen Review Panels Annual Report

June 2008

PREPARED FOR

**The Tennessee Department of Children's
Services**



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

Tennessee Citizen Review Panels Annual Report

June 2008

PREPARED FOR

**The Tennessee Department of Children's
Services**

BY

TONI LAWAL, M.S.

RORY ALLEY, M. Ed.



**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 # 08063

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Tennessee’s Citizen Review Panels	4
Location	4
Member Selection	5
CRP Activities for 2007–2008	6
Meeting with Commissioner Miller	6
Montgomery County Activities	7
Shelby County Activities	8
Northwest Region Activities	9
Other Potential or Suggested Future CRP Activities:	10
Chairs and Member Attend the National CRP Conference in St. Paul/Minneapolis	10
Recommendations from Citizen Review Panels	12
Multiple Response System (MRS) Report Summary	14
Conclusion.....	16
Appendix A: Citizen Review Panel Members	17
Montgomery County Citizen Review Panel Membership	18
Shelby County Citizen Review Panel Membership	19
Northwest Region Citizen Review Panel Membership.....	20

Appendix B: Statewide CRP Conference Materials 21

 Tennessee Citizen Review Panel Annual Statewide Meeting
 Agenda 22

 Persons Attending the Statewide Annual CRP Conference 23

Appendix C: Case Review and Focus Group Instruments..... 24

 Case Evaluation Form, Tennessee Citizen Review Panel
 for Clarksville, Montgomery County 25

 Montgomery County’s Citizen Review Panel
 Focus Group Questions 27

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. Several aspects of this act have raised questions and concerns about Panel members' roles and responsibilities; therefore, a set of *Frequently Asked Questions About the Citizen Review Panel and the Child Abuse Prevention Treatment Act* has been developed. This document answers several of the questions that are typically on the minds of individuals who are new to CRPs and to organizations/agencies that support child welfare programs. Please be aware that laws and regulations change and are subject to different interpretations. The *Frequently Asked Questions* is intended to provide the reader with helpful guidance, not legal advice. For more information about CRPs and CAPTA, please visit the National Resource Center for Child Protective Services website at www.nrccps.org.

1. What is the Child Abuse Prevention Treatment Act of 1996?

CAPTA is an act created by the United States government to provide federal funding to states in order to help prevent, identify, and treat child abuse and neglect. It created the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, developed standards for receiving and responding to reports of child maltreatment, and established a clearinghouse on the prevention and treatment of abuse and neglect. Changes in 1996 reinforced the Acts' emphasis on child safety; thus resulting in the establishment of Citizen Review Panels.

2. Who may serve on Citizen Review Panels?

Federal legislation requires that each individual CRP be "broadly representative of the communities in which the panel is established." Panel members should be

familiar with the intricacies of the Child Protective Services' work (CPS). Representatives from the Department of Children Services (DCS), law enforcement, school system, foster parents, colleges of social work and organizations such as state chapters of Child Advocacy Centers, Prevent Child Abuse, and Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) typically serve as panel members.

Upon being selected, members commit to a two (2) year term of service on their local CRPs and are given a brief overview regarding the role of the panel and expectations of members.

3. How many CRPs are there in Tennessee?

Currently, there are three CRPs in the state—Memphis/Shelby County, Northwest Region, and Clarksville/Montgomery County.

Each CRP has a Tennessee Department of Children Services liaison that serves as an advisor to the Panel on various policies and procedures. CRP members are selected for the Panel by the local region. All three existing panels have strong representation from local school systems, child advocacy centers, and local child advocates.

4. How often should panel members meet?

Panels must meet at least quarterly, but the number of meetings held per year is flexible. Members are volunteers and the number of meetings per year is ultimately determined by their availability. Generally anywhere from 4 to 8 meetings are held per year and a number of methods may be used to conduct these meetings, including but not limited to: face to face meetings, conference calls, lunch or dinner meetings, teleconferencing, etc.

5. What are the role and responsibilities of panel members?

Panel members are required to examine policies and procedures to determine whether state and local agencies are effectively discharging their child protection responsibilities and are in compliance with the state Child Abuse Prevention Treatment Act (CAPTA). However, because the CRP mandate is so broadly defined, it does not give a clear sense of direction. Therefore, the primary role of panel members is to be a community partner of the local child welfare agency and to address issues concerning the child protection system in a manner that is supportive and unbiased.

6. Does the federal law allow one panel to review agency compliance with the CAPTA plan, another Panel to review agency performance in the area of coordinating with foster care and adoption services, and a third to review a local agency and its performance?

No, each Panel must perform all of the enumerated functions. However, one panel can conduct in-depth reviews of a small number of child protective service cases,

another examines a broader number of case files, and yet another examine the information available through the statewide data system.

7. How should Panels decide which policy or procedure to examine?

First, you should determine how your local panel can be helpful to the CPS system and what particular areas of the system would most benefit from outside review. This can be done by looking at the agency's discharge of its duties and at the interactions, strengths, and weaknesses of the CPS system as a whole, including community-based services and other agencies such as the Tennessee Center for Child Welfare (TCCW).

8. How do Citizen Review Panels (CRPs) differ from Community Advisory Boards (CABs)?

Citizen Review Panels are established by federal statute, funded by CAPTA, and examine issues to support child protection systems while Community Advisory Boards are a state initiative designed to support the implementation of Multiple Response Systems (MRS). Also, CABs focus primarily on the issue of service delivery unique to their local community.

9. What policies or procedures can or have Panels examined?

CRPs can:

- Conduct focus groups to assess service delivery, job satisfaction, inter-departmental relationships, and culturally responsive practices.
- Evaluate CPS pre-service specialty training, qualifications of trainers and CPS staff, job turnover, etc.
- Examine assessment tools and case finding.
- Conduct case reviews.

CRPs have:

- Identified successful community-based child protection systems and approaches for duplicating successful systems elsewhere.
- Developed a web-based Child Abuse Reporting guide.

10. Are Panels required to produce a report for DCS?

Yes. The University of Tennessee staff prepares an annual report documenting the Panels' activities and recommendations to improve CPS at the state and local level.

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 borders the state of Kentucky and has a large military base within the city limits. The unique population of military personnel, both active and retired, 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 young and struggling with the development of new relationships in addition to the stresses associated with military deployment. CPS staff members, in this area, 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 analyze 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 Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) in Tennessee. The need for monetary support within a family is a factor that contributes to additional family stress/issues that eventually bring the children and their families to the attention of the TDCS. A 2006 report by the Urban Child Institute described single-mother births as the most dangerous condition for children in Shelby County.

It is also a contributing factor for one-and-two thirds of all of the maltreated children in the child welfare system.

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 the 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 have been three meetings with TDCS leadership in Knox County to discuss the technical assistance necessary to establish a Panel in the region this year.

Member Selection

Each CRP has a Tennessee Department of Children's Services liaison that serves as an advisor to the panel on the various policies and procedures of the department. CRP members were selected for the panel by the local region. Membership was based on specific guidelines included in the *Citizen Review Panels for the Child Protective Services System Guidelines and Protocols*. The CRPs began new endeavors to recruit additional members in the 2007–2008 period with an emphasis on selecting members from areas that are not currently well represented within the panels including law enforcement, health care, university faculty/staff, etc.

CRP Activities for 2007–2008

This report details CRPs activities for the past fiscal year and their efforts to fulfill the enumerated functions for which they were developed. In addition, Citizen Review Panel members held their statewide conference on April 29, 2008, in Jackson, Tennessee. The conference provided an opportunity for Panel members to increase their knowledge of current CPS issues in order to enhance their ability to make informed recommendations and to develop new goals. These recommendations have been forwarded to TDCS Commissioner Viola Miller. Some of the CRPs activities are highlighted in this report.

Meeting with Commissioner Miller

CRP Chairs met with Commissioner Viola Miller on March 17, 2008 to share the Panels' work activities progress and concerns as well as to follow up on recommendations submitted to TDCS last fiscal year. The Chairs asked the Commissioner if there were any specific needs or focus she would like for the Panels to consider as a work activity. Commissioner Miller recommended that the Panels consider a review of the dependent, neglected bench order cases, and noted that Tennessee is the number one state in the nation for the number of teenagers in care. Should the CRPs consider the recommendation, Commissioner Miller suggested they develop their work product with the following two questions in mind:

1. How to hold parents accountable for keeping their children in school?
2. How to better serve both the children within and the children outside of the state system?

Montgomery County Activities

This panel met a total of five (5) times on the following dates:

July 26, 2007—Panel members met at the Montgomery County Child Advocacy Centers (CAC) and discussed postponing the anticipated case reviews for their area until changes in the Multiple Response System were implemented. They decided in the meantime to conduct a focus group of local frontline staff and supervisors involved in CPS work. Members also identified potential new members to draft into their CRP.

September 7, 2007—Members met to conduct a focus group of CPS staff and supervisors using questions developed from reviewing local region child abuse data listed by referent and classification sources from DCS. CRP members asked the following questions:

- How is it determined which child/family is referred for services?
- What services are available for families?
- Are the services meeting the needs of the child/family?
- What are the barriers to clients receiving recommended services?
- How effective are the services?

November 2, 2007—UT staff met with the new Montgomery County CRP Co-Chair Amelia Wallace, to further discuss new member selection and recruiting and to review concerns that came out of the prior focus group meeting. In addition, Wallace determined that the panel might want to consider following up on DCS staff concerns with a survey in the next fiscal year to assess what impact MRS has had on services.

March 8, 2008—CRP members met at the Department of Children's Services office on Pageant Lane in Clarksville to conduct a review of current DCS file cases from their area. The Case Review Process was envisioned as a way of assisting DCS in its efforts towards continuing improvements in the child protective services system. Cases of varying risk rating and classification were reviewed; of them 6 were indicated, 8 were unfounded, and 1 was found unable to complete. Strengths, concerns, and recommendations from reviewing the cases were compiled and forwarded to TDCS.

April 29, 2008—CRP members from throughout the state met to have an annual retreat in Jackson, Tennessee. Montgomery County formed the following goals for the upcoming year:

- Investigate what and how much extra training therapeutic foster homes must have initially each year as well as after completing PATH training.

- Conduct another case file review to assess if the region is demonstrating a better level of service provision.
- Explore Tennessee Center on Child Welfare CPS specialty training in comparison to other states and look at follow-up training for DCS staff after being on the job for 6 months in order to assess the following:
 - Specific job roles/responsibilities
 - Staff retention
 - Effectiveness of pre-service training

Shelby County Activities

The Shelby County CRP met a total of seven (7) times.

June 12, 2007—Shelby County CRP members got an update on implementation of the Multiple Response System (MRS) across the state from the newly appointed statewide Director of MRS, Marjahna Hart. Hart indicated that MRS would be implemented in Shelby County in three (3) pilot sites defined by zip codes. The group then looked at consecutive steps for the upcoming year, including an effort to gain more information about CPS referrals made by school and medical personnel.

September 11, 2007—Members assembled at the Memphis City Schools Bond Building to meet Toni Lawal, the new statewide Coordinator of the CRPs. They discussed changes to the TCS 37-1-403 law on child abuse/neglect reporting and the implications these changes would have on the computer-based child abuse reporting website and training. Recommendations from this discussion were forwarded to the TDCS Child Safety Office. The CRP also began their review of referent source data on CPS Investigation Classification for Shelby County to discern trends in reporting sources.

October 2007—UT Staff met with the new TDCS Shelby County Team Coordinator, Shandrian Guinn and discussed updates to the computer-based reporting website. It was agreed that changes to the website should wait until 2008 due to revisions expected to MRS and CPS policies (particularly to response priorities P-1 and P-2).

December 11, 2007—UT staff distributed a detailed report of perpetrator category and role obtained from TDCS to CRP members for their analysis. The group then discussed the recent review of TDCS case files by the Montgomery County CRP and Shelby County Members decided to obtain similar data from their region for review. A discussion took place on how to handle cases when children were afraid to go home and resulted in the suggestion from CRP members that local DCS staff provide

schools with names of team coordinators to contact when the school system has concerns.

March 19, 2008—UT staff met with the TDCS Shelby County Regional Administrator Merlene Hyman, and the Team Coordinator, Shandrian Guinn, to discuss local CRP work activities and explore ways to support the local DCS office. There was discussion about possibly reviewing near fatality and fatality cases.

April 29, 2008—Members came together in Jackson, Tennessee during an annual retreat. Shelby County formed the following goals for the upcoming fiscal year:

- Assess DCS repeat “unfounded” cases.
- Review at least one case shared by LeBonheur Center for Children and Parents and the local DCS to assess any gaps in services.

May 6, 2008—Panel Members held a case review selecting one case involving child injury for detailed review. Following the review the group held a debriefing to discuss case strengths, concerns, and recommendations. From that debriefing a question was posed, “Who has the responsibility to ensure children’s safety?” Members concurred that there is a shared responsibility of all community partners including the Shelby County CRP to work to ensure that children are kept safe.

Northwest Region Activities

The Northwest CRP met four (4) times on the following dates:

September 26, 2007—Northwest Panel members met at Milan Middle School in Milan, Tennessee and engaged in a conversation about Northwest CRP strengths and areas for improvement. Members then discussed responding to concerns that came out of the last focus group. To end the meeting, panel members began a draft of a letter to recruit new members. Areas defined for recruiting new members were law enforcement, a representative from Carl Perkins Vocational Center, and the TDCS MRS Resource Linkage network.

December 3, 2007—The meeting began with introductions and welcoming of new members recently drafted to the Northwest group. A discussion followed concerning a focus group with a representative from Youth Villages to voice concerns from a prior focus group with DCS staff. A planned case review was postponed until a later meeting. CRP members discussed a variety of potential projects for future meetings.

February 4, 2008—The meeting was held at the Weldon Library in Martin, Tennessee. It began with a discussion about a proposed survey to serve as a follow-up questionnaire to a focus group activity conducted in one of last year’s meetings. Referent data for North Western counties was distributed for panel members to review and provide comments. It was noted that the most frequent referent source

was consistent with what other regions in the state were observing.

April 29, 2008—Members met in Jackson, Tennessee with other CRP members from across the state. The Northwest group proposed the following goals for the upcoming fiscal year:

- Analyze data on services.
- Assess child fatality case numbers for the region.
- Ensure quality work and stay focused on the goals. Members proposed to conduct conference calls quarterly in addition to the quarterly face to face meetings.

Other Potential or Suggested Future CRP Activities:

- Review the revised CPS policies that became effective 01/01/08.
- Conduct a customer satisfaction survey (TDCS consumers).
- Evaluate new hires pre-service/in-service classroom training experiences and/or curriculum.
- Host community forums on issues relevant to CPS.
- Establish guidelines and procedures to improve CPS work.
- Be creative and innovative (i.e. create car window decals or magnets to promote the safety of children).
- Volunteer to train TDCS staff (i.e. topics on methamphetamine, documenting effective case notes, time management).
- Assess the racial disparities of the foster care placement rates of urban teens.

Chairs and Member Attend the National CRP Conference in St. Paul/Minneapolis

In addition to the preceding activities, CRP Chairpersons Mayme Stephenson (Montgomery County), Sandra Allen (Shelby County), and member Joetta Yarbrow (Northwest) attended the National Citizen Review Panel Conference in St. Paul/Minneapolis, May 21–23, 2008. This is the first time since the national conference has been held that it has taken place outside of the state of Kentucky. Two of these CRP members had not attended a CRP conference of this scope and looked forward to learning: what challenges other states face in conducting their duties, what progress they have made in carrying out these duties, and the successes they have garnered along the way. UT staff member and CRP Coordinator,

Toni Lawal, also attended this meeting. Panel members were asked to develop an action plan identifying one thing their panel could do that would have the most significant impact on keeping children safe from abuse and neglect in the upcoming year and to share this information at their next meeting for input from their colleagues. The CRPs have several goals for the 2008–2009 fiscal year and will continue to work to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of services available in the child welfare system. They will also collaborate with the community and organizations/groups that are working towards making Tennessee more supportive of children and families.

Recommendations from Citizen Review Panels

Concern: Changes in TDCS policy or initiatives have rendered some portions of the computer based website training on child abuse reporting obsolete.

Recommendation 1: Update the mandatory child abuse reporting computer-based training to reflect current policies and program initiatives (i.e. the Multiple Response System).

Concern: Child abuse mandated reporters are often uninformed as to whether their report has been followed-up on.

Recommendation 2: Ensure quality assurances within Central Intake and the Regional Office as it pertains to the **Confidential Letter for Reporter** for both screen-in and screen-out referrals by developing a plan for monitoring and evaluating the set goals/objectives. Also Policy 14.1 does not appear to be clear regarding the coordination and tasks for the Regional Office and Central Intake staff concerning completing the letters.

Concern: While reviewing cases, Panel members expressed concern about why a forensic interviewer did not interview a young victim of sexual abuse and the availability of forensic training for frontline workers.

Recommendation 3: Caseworkers who have the responsibility of initial investigation should obtain forensic interviewing training and/or encourage the use of Forensic Interviewers from the CAC to assist with interviews of children.

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 the TDCS's efforts.

*Recommendation 4: Panel members would like TDCS to follow up on the recommendation (April 2007) to 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 the TDCS child protection system. By providing this information, TDCS has an opportunity to draw on the strengths of community partners to support TDCS initiatives (i.e. Child Family Service Review, Quality Service Review, in-service training).*

Concern: During the review of CPS cases, Panel members observed many of the files did not reflect services provided on substantiation of abuse and/or neglect and that some forms were difficult to locate.

Recommendation 5: Encourage CPS workers to describe actions taken to provide services for children and families—name of service agency, contact person, timeframes, etc., and to maintain case files in a systematic order to ensure that the next reader(s) can easily locate the information.

Multiple Response System (MRS) Report Summary

The Tennessee Department of Children's Services (TDCS) continues to make strides in the statewide implementation of the Multiple Response System (MRS). MRS polices have been finalized and current pre-service CPS specialty curriculum reflects the three-track response system (Investigative, Assessment, and Resource Linkage). The following information concerning MRS was provided by TDCS.

Each of the twelve regions has completed an Internal Readiness Assessment Tool, which was used as a means of measuring levels of preparedness prior to implementing MRS. This tool has proven to be critical in helping regions to determine training needs and communication gaps. It has also been instrumental in identifying the importance of coordinating and teaming up with internal and external stakeholders and community partners. Central Office Program Staff have assisted the regions with the completion of the Readiness tool, and have provided guidance to help the regions determine how to accomplish different tasks and address the regional needs.

Local community advisory boards have been established in many areas of the state and have proven to be very beneficial to the successful implementation of MRS and community buy-in. TDCS is on track to implement local Community Advisory Boards (CABs) in all 95 counties within the state of Tennessee. Currently, CABs are implemented in the following counties:

Scott	Bedford	Rhea	Putnam
Hamilton	Coffee	Sequatchie	Smith
Greene	Lawrence	Chester	Van Buren
Hawkins	Lincoln	Decatur	Warren
Sullivan	Marshall	Hardin	Macon
Carter	Maury	Henderson	Pickett
Johnson	Moore	Madison	White
Washington	Lewis	McNairy	Jackson
Benton	Perry	Fayette	Clay

In the ongoing implementation stages of MRS, it is critical that TDCS have a plethora of community resources and services available. As CRPs continue to identify ways to support TDCS, Panel members can play a key role and be a valued ally in supporting the needs of children and families in Tennessee.

Conclusion

While the upcoming year poses financial constraints for many of Tennessee's state agencies including its child welfare system, the Citizen Review Panels will continue to work with TDCS and its' leadership team to ensure that the child welfare system in Tennessee has adequate resources to meet the needs of children and families in our state. The pending decisions concerning the state budget are likely to have a devastating impact on the child protection system and, as citizen advocates, CRPs see their role as instrumental in supporting and sustaining a system of continuity for children and families who comes in contact with the child welfare system. Given the changing economic climate, CRPs look forward to working with the TDCS and all other stakeholders in Tennessee's child welfare system to support our children and bolster the mission of helping children thrive.

Activities and meetings of the Tennessee Citizen Review Panels in the past year have often coalesced towards a common conclusion, that "Safe Children and Healthy Families Are a Shared Responsibility."

Appendix A

Citizen Review Panel Members

Montgomery County Citizen Review Panel Membership

Mayme Stephenson, Staff Development & Training Specialist, Austin-Peay State University (TCCW), Co-Chair

Amelia Wallace, Team Coordinator, Tennessee Department of Children's Services (Retired), Co-Chair

Maria Carrier, LCSW, Blanchfield Army Community Hospital

Judy Covington, Executive Director, Montgomery County Child Advocacy Center

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

Debra Bucy, Guidance Counselor, Clarksville-Montgomery County Schools

Sandra Smith-Williams, Youth Services Officer, Montgomery County Juvenile Court

Marion Biggs, Team Coordinator, Tennessee Department of Children's Services

Detective Alan Charvis, Clarksville Police Department

Amy Blayney, Child & Youth Case Manager, Centerstone Center for Behavioral Health

Debbie Striclyn, Legal Assistant, Gasaway Massey Adoption Attorneys

Linda Lloyd, Child Care Program Coordinator, Tennessee Department of Human Services

Shelby County Citizen Review Panel Membership

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

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

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

Nancy Williams, Executive Director, Memphis Child Advocacy Center

Susan Steppe, Director of Child Assessment, LeBonheur Center for Children and Parents

Angela Hargrave, Student Services Specialist, Shelby County Schools

Shandrian Guinn, Team Coordinator, Tennessee Department of Children's Services

Angela Johnson, Team Coordinator, Shelby County, Tennessee Department of Children's Services

Dee Dee Lunsford, Director of School Counseling, Shelby County Schools

Jean McIvor, Clinical Associate Professor, Loewenberg School of Nursing

Northwest Region Citizen Review Panel Membership

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

Marilyn Goodman, Supervisor of Pupil Services, Milan Special School District, Co-Chair

Chanesia Dixon, Center Director, NW Tennessee Head Start Program

Officer Dennis Mitchell, Milan City Police Department

Kim Morris, MSSW Specialist, Northwest Region, Tennessee Center for Child Welfare

Phyllis Webb, Team Coordinator Northwest Region, Child Protective Services, Tennessee Department of Children's Services

Kitty Oliver, Regional Administrator, Northwest Tennessee Department of Children's Services

Ellarine Moses, Retired Guidance Counselor

Joetta Yarbro, Director of Northwest Tennessee Family Resource Center, Dyer County Schools

Appendix B

Statewide CRP Conference Materials

Tennessee Citizen Review Panel Annual Statewide Meeting Agenda

April 29, 2008

University of Tennessee and
Madison County Extension Office
309 North Parkway Jackson, TN 38301

- | | | |
|-------|------------------------------|--|
| 9:30 | Hello and Welcome | CRP Chairs: Sandra Allen, Shelby County Amelia Wallace and Mayme Stephenson; Montgomery County, Dana Cobb and Marilyn Goodman; Northwest Toni Lawal and Rory Alley, UT Staff |
| 10:00 | Purpose of Today's Meeting | Toni Lawal |
| 10:20 | Break | |
| 10:30 | TDCS Central Intake Update | Joe Saladino, Director, TDCS Central Intake; Heather Ray, Training Coordinator, TDCS CI |
| 11:30 | Lunch | Tennessee Symbols and Emblems Quiz (prizes) Rory Alley |
| 12:00 | Tips for CRP Success | Dr. Blake Jones, National CRP Coordinator |
| 1:00 | Local CRP Plan Development | CRPs Meet to Discuss Future Goals and Potential Recommendations to TDCS |
| 1:45 | Report Back from Chairs | Montgomery County, Northwest TN, Shelby County, CRP Chairs |
| 2:00 | Consensus on Recommendations | |
| 2:20 | Wrap Up and Goodbye | Toni Lawal Toni Lawal |

Persons Attending the Statewide Annual CRP Conference

Northwest CRP:

Dana Cobb, Co-Chair, Tennessee Commission on Children and Youth

Marilyn Goodman, Co-Chair, Milan Special School District

Chanesia Dixon, NW Head Start Program

Joetta Yarbro, Dyer City Schools

Kitty Oliver, Northwest Tennessee Region Department of Children's Services

Shelby County CRP

Sandra Allen, Chair, LeBonheur Center for Children and Parents

Susan Steppe, LeBonheur Center for Children and Parents

Randy Schnell, Memphis City Schools

Angela Hargrave, Shelby County Schools

Shandrian Guinn, Shelby County Tennessee Department of Children's Services

Montgomery County CRP

Amelia Wallace, Co-chair, Tennessee Department of Children's Services (retired)

Mayme Stephenson, Co-chair, TCCW, Austin-Peay State University

Debra Bucy, Clarksville-Montgomery County Schools

Sandra Smith-Williams, Montgomery County Juvenile Court

Amy Blayney, Centerstone Center for Behavioral Health

Debbie Striclyn, Gasaway Massey Adoption Attorneys

Marion Biggs, Montgomery County Tennessee Department of Children's Services

Other Attendees

Jacky Ingram, Knox County Tennessee Department of Children's Services

Joe Saladino and Heather Ray, TDCS Central Office, Central Intake

Christina Dotson, TDCS Central Office, Child Protective Services

Blake Jones, University of Kentucky

Toni Lawal and Rory Alley, University of Tennessee SWORPS

Appendix C

Case Review and Focus Group Instruments

**Case Evaluation Form
Tennessee Citizen Review Panel
Clarksville, Montgomery County**

Case Number: (Unique Identifier that we assign)

1. Specific Allegations of Harm: Check all that apply.

Physical Abuse		Substantial Risk of Physical Abuse		Drug Exposed Infant	
Drug Exposed Child		Environmental Neglect		Nutritional Neglect	
Medical Neglect		Educational Neglect		Lack of Supervision	
Abandonment		Sexual Abuse		Substantial Risk Of Sexual Abuse	
Psychological Harm		Child Fatality			

2. Number of children in the home?

3. Ages of the children:

4. What is the risk rating on the Structured Decision Making Form?

5. What is the classification of the case? (Check all that apply.)

Allegation indicated, perpetrator indicated	
Allegation indicated, perpetrator unfounded	
Allegation indicated, perpetrator unknown	
Allegation unfounded, perpetrator unfounded	
Allegation indicated, sexually reactive child	
Unable to complete	

6. Is there a Plan of Action in the case? Yes or No

7. Is there a Safety Plan? (A document reviewed by the court.) Yes or No

8. Is there a functional assessment in the file? Yes or No

9. In your opinion, does this case record indicate that the family has service needs? Yes or No

10. What are the service needs?

11. Was the case referred for Family Services or some other service?

12. What services was the family referred for?

**Montgomery County
Citizen Review Panel
Focus Group Questions**

1. How is it determined which child/family is referred for services?
2. What services are available for families?
3. Are the services meeting the needs of the child/family? (Quality)
4. What are the barriers to clients receiving recommended services?
5. How effective are the services?