

**California Permanency for Youth Task Force  
Practice and Policy Joint Committee Meeting**

August 6, 2009

10:00 am to 2:00 pm

Elihu M. Harris State Building, Oakland, CA

**PLEASE NOTE NEW DATE FOR NEXT MEETING**

**Next Meeting:** November 5, 2009, 10:00 am to 2:00 pm, Elihu M. Harris State Building

**Present**

**James Anderson**, California Connected by 25 Initiative  
**Robert Friend**, California Permanency for Youth Project  
**Rosalio Garcia**, Fresno County  
**Jill Jacobs**, Family Builders  
**Chantel Johnson**, California Youth Connection  
**Eileen Johnson**, California Permanency for Youth Project  
**Gail Johnson Vaughan**, Mission Focused Solutions  
**Fredi Juni**, Alameda County  
**Susanna Kniffen**, Casey Family Programs  
**Jude Koski**, California Youth Connection  
**Crystal Luffberry**, California Co-Investment Partnership  
**Jon Pettigrew**, Alameda County  
**Ginger Pierce**, Monterey County  
**Jennifer Rodriguez**, Youth Law Center  
**Veronica Salmeron**, Fresno County  
**Carroll Schroeder**, California Alliance of Child & Family Services  
**Julia Waters**, California Youth Connection  
**Gayle Wilson**, Co-Investment Partnership

**Absent (those who RSVPed only)**

**Robin Allen**, California CASA Association  
**Carol Biddle**, Kinship Center  
**Nenita Dean**, Stanislaus County  
**Melissa Driscoll**, Rebekah Children's Services  
**Kristie Esquivel**, Kern County  
**Karen Grace-Kaho**, State of California  
**Karen Gunderson**, California Dept. of Social Services  
**Sophia Isom**, San Francisco County  
**Kat Lauterback**, San Luis Obispo County  
**Jean Little**, Stanislaus County  
**Robin Lockett**, Alameda County  
**Bob Malmberg**, Orange County  
**Nancy McDonald**, Family Builders  
**Monica Rios-Hennecke**, Families First, Inc.

**Shalinda Roan**, San Mateo County  
**Emily Nicole Villas**, California Youth Connection  
**Diane Wagner**, Los Angeles County

### **Agenda**

9:30 am Continental Breakfast

10:00 am Joint Committee Meeting

- Welcome and check-in
- Review of minutes and action items
- Update on AB 665
  - Implications
  - What we can all do to prepare for implementation
- Other budget results and implications
- AAP (Adoption Assistance Program) discussion
- CYC (California Youth Connection)
  - planning and priorities for the coming year, and a
  - check-in regarding what is working/not working with the Task Force
- Task Force future/CPYP update

12:00 pm Lunch

12:30 pm Continue with agenda

2:00 pm Adjourn

## Minutes

### Introduction, Review of Minutes and Action Items

Bob Friend welcomed the group and attendees introduced themselves.

The minutes were approved and accepted.

The group reviewed action items from the previous meeting and gave updates.

### **Policy Committee Recommendations/Permanency Crosswalk**

- The Task Force Recommendations from the January 15, 2009 meeting will be added to the Co-Investment Permanency Crosswalk as a new column. Bob Friend, Gail Johnson Vaughan and Eileen Johnson will take the lead on this task. IN PROCESS.
- Crystal Luffberry will keep the Task Force apprised of developments from STEC (California Statewide Training and Education Committee) regarding the inclusion of permanency in core curricula. UPDATE: a grant proposal has been submitted to the Walter S. Johnson Foundation for curriculum development and training by CalSWEC (California Social Work Education Center).

### **History of Permanency Narrative**

- Bob Friend will schedule a conference call (or calls) to discuss how permanency developed as a national movement and the role of CPYP in the process. Participants will include: Pat Reynolds-Harris, Gail Johnson Vaughan, Mardi Louisell, Teri Kook, Robin Allen, Jennifer Rodriguez, Jill Jacobs, Julia Waters, and possibly Judge Nash and Robin Luckett. IN PROCESS. Friend did not try to engage people in the last quarter due to the budget crisis, but he will be going forward this quarter, as he now has an assignment to write about the history of CPYP for the Stuart Foundation.

### **Updates to Alameda Guide to Permanency Options for Youth**

- Fredi Juni will send Eileen Johnson (CPYP) an electronic version of the updates presented at the meeting. Johnson will then distribute to Task Force, other CPYP constituents, and post on CPYP website. Juni anticipates the final version will be ready in a couple of weeks. COMPLETED.
- CYC representatives at the meeting requested a chance to give feedback on the revisions before they are finalized. They will coordinate with Jon Pettigrew, Alameda County. COMPLETED.

### Additional Updates

- Fredi Juni reported that based on additional feedback she received from someone from the state regarding Chafee funds, she will slightly revise the language on two handouts. She plans to finalize the revisions within the next week and will send the revised copies to Eileen Johnson for distribution. The revisions are:
  - 1) *Considering Adoption or Legal Guardianship?*, page 2, second column, “Regarding Legal Guardianship,” last bullet. The sentence originally read, “Youth in foster care up to or after their 16<sup>th</sup> birthday are eligible for Chafee funding for college.” Juni realized this was potentially confusing, so the words “up to or” have been deleted.

- 2) *Understanding Access to College Financial Aid for Former Foster Youth*, page 2, third question: What are Chafee funds, and who is eligible?, the fourth to the last line. The sentence originally read, “All youth that were in foster care placement for any amount of time between their 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> birthdays . . .” The state person wanted to add (bolded text): “All youth that were in foster care **and were court dependents** for any amount of between their 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> birthdays . . .” The group also suggested added “or wards” after the text “court dependents.”
- Jill Jacobs, Family Builders, reported that San Francisco County is working on their version of the permanency guide. A draft has been prepared; it will incorporate the revisions to the Alameda Guide, and will be available in both English and Spanish.

### **ICPC Issues**

- Jennifer Rodriguez will put together a survey to counties, asking them for information about their experience/practice with ICPC, and their success rate. IN PROCESS. Jennifer will prepare a draft and send it to the Task Force; it is hoped the survey will help identify what the specific issues/barriers are. The group also wanted to know how California is doing as a respondent in ICPC cases. Once the survey is completed, the group will determine the best audience to send it to. To ensure good participation, we need to frame it well: we are trying to figure out what the delay is in ICPC cases, and how we can fix it.
- Find out about the role of the state in ICPC. Gail Johnson Vaughan will talk to Karen Gunderson regarding ICPC roles. COMPLETED. Gunderson reported that CDSS has no ability to impact other states’ ICPC process.
- Gail Johnson Vaughan will contact Voice for Adoption and see if they can help resolve the issue. COMPLETED. They agreed that it was a good issue. Johnson Vaughan does not know if they have followed through.
- Jill Jacobs will contact the National Resource Center for Family-Centered Practice and Permanency Planning. IN PROCESS. She has contacted them, but there has been no response yet.
- Ginger Pierce will talk to her ICPC contact in Monterey County. COMPLETED.

### **Legislative Updates**

#### **AB 665 (Torrico) State Adoption Services: Investment – Gail Johnson Vaughan**

(see additional discussion below)

The bill has passed the Assembly and necessary Senate Committees on consent and is ready to go to the Senate floor. They did have to make a revision to the language removing the requirement that counties reinvest savings achieved through youth permanence into improving youth permanence outcomes. The bill, amended July 23, 2009, now reads:

SECTION 1. Section 16131.5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code is amended to read:

16131.5. (a) The state shall reinvest adoption incentive payments received through the implementation of the federal Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-351) into the child welfare system, in order to provide legal permanency outcomes for older children, including, but not limited to, adoption,

guardianship, and reunification of children whose reunification services were previously terminated.

(b) The incentive payments received pursuant to subdivision (a), upon appropriation by the Legislature in the annual Budget Act or another statute, shall be allocated by the State Department of Social Services to the counties, and the department for a county in which the department serves as an adoption agency, based on documented increases in legal permanency outcomes for older children achieved by each county, as determined by the department, in consultation with counties, for the purposes specified in this section.

(c) A county, or the department when it acts as the adoption agency for a county, shall use adoption incentive payment funds to improve or sustain legal permanency outcomes for older children. ~~A county shall reinvest savings that result from successful legal permanency outcome efforts for older children into activities that improve legal permanency outcomes for older children.~~ *children.*

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to supplant funds currently being spent on programs to provide legal permanency outcomes.

Source: California State Legislature, "AB 665," [http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill\\_asm/ab\\_0651-0700/ab\\_665\\_bill\\_20090723\\_amended\\_sen\\_v95.html](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill_asm/ab_0651-0700/ab_665_bill_20090723_amended_sen_v95.html) (Accessed August 13, 2009)

### **AB 295 (Ammiano) Children: wrap-around and adoption services – Jill Jacobs**

This bill would provide a no-cost extension of funds for the Older Youth Adoption Project (OYA) to June 30, 2010. OYA is a pilot project with five counties, with a set amount of funding. The pilot started late because of a delay in implementation. Because of the late start, there will be money left over at the end (December 31, 2009), so the counties asked for a six-month no-cost extension. Originally, there was no opposition to the bill. However, when it reached the Senate, the Dept. of Finance decided that additional funding was involved (1.3 million), even though the money has already been allocated. The latest development is that the OYA piece will be pulled out of the bill in order not to kill the other portion which supports wraparound and mental health. It is very frustrating, because the project has good outcomes with demonstrated cost savings.

### **AB 12 (Beall) California Fostering Connections to Success Act – Jennifer Rodriguez**

After the last Task Force meeting, Jennifer Rodriguez held a conference call which included Jill Jacobs, Ginger Pierce, and Gail Johnson Vaughan to see if people were willing to develop some amendments around permanency for the bill.

#### Background

Language that was previously in AB 12 listed a youth's age as a compelling reason not to hold a 366.26 determination of parental rights hearing; the bill stated that the judge shall order the youth to remain in long-term foster care (LTFC). The only other mention of any permanency effort was that the case planning meeting in the transitional independent living plan should include information about significant connections. This language raised concerns, because LTFC is eliminated for youth under 18, but for all youth age 18-21 who remain in foster care, LTFC is the only option and is the preferred option. The language sends the message that there shouldn't be permanency for older youth. There were also concerns about all the legalities involved with permanency work for youth over 18. The bill does not dictate when or how one should do older youth adoption. Many legal permanency options available for youth under 18 are not available

for older youth. Amendments were submitted to shore up the permanency aspects of the bill. The permanency amendments have been submitted to the legislative counsel as amendments, and have the support of the AB 12 co-sponsors. These amendments:

- Remove all references to LTFC in the bill. The judge can still order it, so it won't change practice on the ground. However, its removal from the bill eliminates a bad policy message.
- Improve the language in the transitional independent living plan and the case plan around permanency. In addition to looking at independent living efforts; other efforts to permanency must be considered, including efforts to maintain or establish connections.

### Adult Adoption

- During the call, issues were raised about adult adoption. A number of attorneys were on the call including birth parents council. Questions were raised whether birth parents' rights are being violated if they are not informed about adult adoption of their child. AB 12 states that the birth parents will get notice unless the youth objects to it, which is appropriate, since the youth is legally an adult and is entitled to make those choices.
- Alameda County has needed to deal with adult adoption in cases where they had began the adoption process with a minor, but before the adoption was finalized the youth turned 18. After consulting with other counties, the Alameda County judges decided to view 18 and 19 year-olds as court dependents. Similarly, in cases where a group of siblings are adopted together, and one or more are 18+, the entire group is considered court dependents. Extending foster care to age 21 may bring this issue more to the table.
- It is better if the law is vague on this point, since at least one county has decided it can do adult adoption under juvenile dependency jurisdiction. Jennifer Rodriguez confirmed that the conference call group came to the same conclusion. Part of problem is that no one has done this type of practice yet and little (or no) resources are available. So, it is better to leave the law vague and let people figure out what works. One key piece is for the law not to say "you *can't* do X."
- Rodriguez suggested that a group of people work on developing some guidelines to help people figure out to do the work on the ground. The guidelines could be refined as we gain more experience.

### Resistance from Lawyers

- Jennifer Rodriguez shared that several attorneys on the call didn't recognize the need for or understand the importance of permanency work for older youth (18 and older). The call illustrated how much work still needs to be done in this area. Some people were incredulous that we think it's both possible and important to have permanency for older youth.
- The strongest resistance came from attorneys, in part because they are so invested in protecting their clients. In general, much of the resistance to permanency work has come from professionals, who fear doing harm to the youth.
- Jill Jacobs, Family Builders, suggested forming a workgroup to work on issues brought up by "hostile" attorneys, so that when we have the opportunity, we have tools to share and distribute. Participants should include attorneys who are permanency champions, such as county counsels in Alameda. Some of the issues raised in the call were extreme, but Jacobs acknowledged they were still real, and we have to look at them. For example,

what is our liability when doing a home study for adult adoption? The more things we can put out to educate people, the better.

- Alice Bussiere and Jennifer Rodriguez from the Youth Law Center co-authored an article on AB 12, with lawyers being the intended audience (Jennifer Pokempner, Jennifer Rodriguez, and Alice Bussiere, “Fostering Connections to Success: Extending a Social Safety Net for Youths Facing Homelessness and Poverty,” *Clearinghouse Review: Journal of Poverty Law and Policy* 43 (July-August 2009): 139-147). The article had a whole section on permanence. The main point was that the goal for these older youth is exactly the same as for any other youth, but the strategies are different. Findings from the Emancipated Youth Connections Project were cited: the main barriers to permanency were lack of access to information, not any of the concerns raised during the conference call.
- Since attorneys are a key group that needs to be targeted, several people suggested making a proposal for a presentation at the Beyond the Bench Conference (December 2009). Chris Wu, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), already has been promoting permanency through the Blue Ribbon Commission, so he is a natural person to co-present with us. Jennifer Rodriguez will put in a placeholder request for Beyond the Bench.

#### **Action Items:**

- Form a workgroup to work on issues that require clarification and education regarding permanency for older youth, so that when we have the opportunity, we have tools to share and distribute.
- Jennifer Rodriguez suggested we develop a TA-type document on permanency for 18-21 year olds to prepare for the implementation of AB 12, assuming it is signed into law. The guidelines could be refined as we gain more experience. Rodriguez agreed to be the contact person for this project.
- Bob Friend will contact Chris Wu regarding the need for a presentation at Beyond the Bench on older youth permanency. COMPLETED
- Jennifer Rodriguez will put in a placeholder request for a presentation at Beyond the Bench. COMPLETED

#### **AB 665 (Torrico) State Adoption Services: Investment – Robert Friend**

What are the implications of AB 665, and how can we prepare for implementation? People don't really know about this legislation. Once it is passed, counties are going to find out they have some work to do, so we may encounter some pushback.

#### **Key Facts**

- Previously, federal dollars had been awarded to counties solely based just on their improved adoption outcomes. Now, the criteria have broadened to include guardianship and reunification in cases where reunification services had previously been terminated.
- The bill directs counties to use incentive funds to improve legal permanency outcomes for children nine and older.

- The money can't be used to supplant current funding for programs already in place.
- The data needed to document outcomes is already available through CWS/CMS (Child Welfare Services/Case Management System), although there are some issues around reunification.

### **Implications**

- The bill will be a huge push to advance youth permanency work. For example, Fresno County has continued the work started by CPYP; compared with non-CPYP counties, they are pretty far ahead, but they still need to keep going. The legislation will add “fuel to the fire” to their own efforts, and also encourage counties who either haven't started or are just getting started with permanency work.
- The bill is a way to communicate/advertise the results of work, along with the implication that results need be tracked. For example, it is good news to take back to the county Board of Supervisors. We can show that there is an opportunity to save money by investing the incentive dollars in the work. Successes can be communicated locally and statewide along with the incentives.
- Tracking will be needed to identify the dollar amount to be received. Social workers may need help to overcome the mentality of “one more thing to do.” Adoption and guardianship data is already being recorded.
- Tracking of reunification is tricky, because not all reunifications are handled the same way, and are not tracked the same way in CWS/CMS. Reunification after termination of reunification service is what needs to be tracked to earn the incentive. Monterey gave an example of a judge who was unwilling to reinstate parental rights, so the county made the birth mom a foster mother of her own child. In addition, the way individual counties record reunifications is not consistent.
- There has been a big push nationally that the federal money be used for post-adoption services. The bill does have language that talks about using the funds to “improve and sustain permanency outcomes” for children nine and older.
- The Families for Life teaming model is another place to talk about the legislation, as it is a potential funding source for the work as it moves forward.
- Because the bill actually encourages work at the front end, and much permanency work has been focused on the back end, there may be some friendly competition among counties. This was seen as a positive by the group; Bob Friend characterized the tension as “coopetition.”

### **Questions**

- Will the baseline remain at the 2007 totals, or will it be recalculated each year, based on the previous year's performance?
- What definition of reunification will be used? For example, are children who exit long-term foster care to their parents included in reunification?



## **Action Items**

- Some type of guidelines to implementation would be very helpful. UC Berkeley should be involved, because they understand CWS/CMS and know how to get the data and make sure it is good. No one at the meeting was eager to take the lead on this project. Kathy Watkins and Diane Wagner from Los Angeles County were suggested. Gail Johnson Vaughan will contact Diane Wagner and Barbara Needell, UC Berkeley. Bob Friend will contact Kathy Watkins.
- Some type of presentation should be made to CWDA (County Welfare Directors Association of California). Because travel restrictions have limited the meetings of the full CWDA, it was suggested that Bob Friend try to get on the agenda of the Children's Committee.

## **Adoption Assistance Program (AAP)**

Under the new budget, for adoptions of children with special needs finalized on or after January 1, 2010, AAP payments will not automatically increase as the child grows older. This will not preclude parents from obtaining automatic increases in the amount of AAP payments, but parents may obtain an increase if they demonstrate through a reassessment that the needs of the child justify such as increase. Currently, AAP payments increase as children grow older commensurate with the state's age-dependent foster family home basic rate

For the 2009-10 Budget, the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) has long list of desired changes for AAP, "to improve its cost-effectiveness." The most onerous is a recommendation that the rate be decreased to 75% of the foster care rate. The main point we need to make is that we don't save money by cutting AAP; instead it drives costs up because children remain in foster care. Because these recommendations are for next year's budget, we have an opportunity to begin advocacy work now. Is this an issue the Task Force would like to take on?

Discussion followed:

- Budget advocacy requires a great amount of work and follow-through.
- Lowering the AAP rate will have a negative effect; it is clearly an obstacle to youth permanency.
- The group recognized that current statute is written in a way that could allow abuse of the AAP program to occur. Review of the AAP rules is needed to assure that the funds are used to meet actual needs of children and to responsibly "tighten up the statute." It is very important to get input from adoptive families on what type of reform is needed.
- There is a perception that the current LAO, who is new, is very resistant to child welfare. To help bridge this "philosophical divide," education of the LAO's office is needed before going to budget issues. Give the LAO a chance to meet adoptive parents and children and hear their stories.
- It is important to give data to budget staff in the legislature. In general, they are very sympathetic, but they need to get the information; they don't have time to look for it on their own. We need to be active in advocating with them; give them the tools they need. There is ample documentation that shows how AAP is cost-effective, and it actually costs more money when the AAP rate is lowered.

- Currently, the federal rule sets the ceiling for AAP at the foster family home rate, including any specialized care increments. States are not required to go as high. However, a question was raised whether federal reform of AAP was also in the works. Gail Johnson Vaughan will check with NACAC (North American Council on Adoptable Children).
- The group consensus was that the scope of resources needed to do effective advocacy was beyond what the Task Force alone could do. However, it was suggested that we partner with other agencies, in particular LAPP (Legal Advocates for Permanent Parenting), the California Alliance of Child & Family Services, and adoptive parents groups. Other possibilities are CAAA (California Association of Adoption Agencies) and CWDA, although there may not be unified support from that group.
- We need to develop a strategy that combines demonstrating cost effectiveness, the voice of adoptive families, and educating the LAO's office. The timing and methods used are key.

**Action Item:**

Gail Johnson Vaughn will check with NACAC regarding the national scene on AAP.

**For additional information on AAP, please see:**

LAO 2009-10 Budget Analysis: [www.lao.ca.gov/analysis\\_2009/ss/ss\\_anl09004002.aspx](http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2009/ss/ss_anl09004002.aspx)

CDSS Adoption Assistance Program ([www.childsworld.ca.gov/PG1303.htm](http://www.childsworld.ca.gov/PG1303.htm))

CDSS Adoption Assistance Program FAQs ([www.childsworld.ca.gov/PG1874.htm](http://www.childsworld.ca.gov/PG1874.htm))

**Budget Update – Carroll Schroeder, California Alliance of Child and Family Services**

- In the original budget passed at the end of July 2009, the rate for group homes and foster family agencies (FFAs) was cut by 10%. Group homes plan to address the loss of 10 to 30% of their beds through a combination of complete closures and downsizing.
- After line item vetoes by the governor, the final budget also includes about a 10% reduction to counties' Child Welfare Services (CWS). We're trying to figure out what that means – is it strictly a cut to the base or more than just the base?
- Education is getting hit really hard.
- The Assembly blocked the Tranquillon Ridge oil drilling project off the coast of Santa Barbara and the borrowing of Highway User Tax Account gasoline money from local governments. “There is speculation that the governor’s decision to target social services funding for cuts was payback to Assembly Democrats for renegeing on the overall budget deal the governor had struck with their leadership” (*Monday Morning*, August 3, 2009).
- More negotiations are possible in August, so the 10% cut to CWS may not stay.
- Next year’s budget is looking even worse, depending on the rate of economic recovery. The expectation is that we will start with a 7 to 8 billion dollar deficit.
- Schroeder also raised the question of the effect job loss will have on foreclosure rate.

## **California Youth Connection (CYC)**

### **Summer Leadership and Policy Conference – Chantel Johnson, CYC**

The conference was held July 24-27, 2009 in Chico, CA. Approximately 155 youth from across the state attended. Prior to the conference (which is an annual event), the CYC Youth Advisory Board chooses four topics for the conference focus. This year, the topics were:

- Family reunification
- Group homes
- Higher education
- Transitional services

The youth work on these topics during the conference, and then present their recommendations to an invited panel on the last day of the conference, as well as develop a work plan for implementation of the recommendations. The attendees also participate in leadership activities. The recommendations are in process of being prepared for distribution.

#### Conference Highlights:

- Family reunification (FR) – The main focus was eligibility for services. CYC would like mandatory follow up with the family by the social worker after FR ends. CYC has done policy work on some of these issues before. However, FR was completely new, and there were more struggles in this area. The FR group had trouble staying focused on the topic and not bringing in other issues.
- Group homes – youth would like staff trainings by foster youth, similar to the training done by the Y.O.U.T.H Training Project.
- Higher education – the focus was on campus support programs, such as Guardian Scholars, Renaissance Scholars, Promise Scholars, etc. Some programs focus more on helping the youth stay in higher education.
- Transitional Services
  - There was a lot of focus on THP-Plus (Transitional Housing Program for Emancipated Foster/Probation Youth). The youth recommended THP-Plus programs do independent fund raising as well as rely on state money.
  - Foster parents need more training on how to help youth transition from foster care and the services they can receive. For example, the foster parents don't know about ILP services.
- The implementation plan identified laws already in place that were not being implemented.

### **Do foster youth know what permanency is?**

Bob Friend asked CYC members if they felt their youth understood the role of permanency. How it can help other services to decrease. Discussion followed.

- Foster youth without permanency don't really understand what permanency is, because it is difficult for youth to envision something they have never experienced.
- Youth want the possibility of reconnection with their birth family. Sometimes, permanency is viewed as an "either/or" choice between the birth family and another permanent connection, when it should be seen as both/and. The issue is difficult to talk about.

- There is difficulty in learning how to/being able to make significant relationships due to frequent placement changes. The youth thinks, “I’m not going to be here long, so what’s the point of even investing in relationships?”
- The voice of youth is critical; they need to be able to express their wants and needs. One youth was adopted at age 17 because her birth parent had died. Her original birth certificate was erased, which was devastating to her.
- Some CYC youth have shared negative experiences with identified permanent connections. The adult either did not follow through on key activities, or was not able to do that role anymore due to personal reasons and did not help the youth through the transition. These adults may not realize the very significant impact their actions may have on the youth. Bob Friend noted that the need for explicit understanding of expectations between *both* persons was crucial.
- CYC members asked whether CPYP had any vehicle for feedback from youth as part of its work with the counties. Specifically, how did the permanency process work for the youth, what was good, what was bad, etc. Friend replied that there is feedback, but it is not consistent. The use of permanency teams does include the opportunity for ongoing feedback, but nothing really systematic is in place.

### **CYC and the Task Force**

Bob Friend asked (1) if participation in the Task Force was beneficial to CYC; (2) how the Task Force could support CYC; and (3) could anything be improved?

- In general, the CYC members present were very positive. They felt that the Task Force provided a venue where they could share their ideas and concerns, and be heard.
- One concern was raised about the use of acronyms and “insider language.” Friend encouraged people to not be afraid to ask questions during the meeting if something was not clear.
- CYC has been in conversation with Valerie Earley, Contra Costa County, regarding CYC youth training county social workers in permanency. Earley is open but wants to see their materials.
- CYC needs to figure out how their agenda relates to permanency. An agenda item for the next meeting: What part of CYC’s recommendations can the Task Force help with?
- Chantel Johnson asked about the mission and focus of the Task Force. Friend explained that, while the Task Force does have a certain focus on yearly goals, its work is also ongoing, because it tries to be at best to be pro-active, or at least immediately responsive, to current developments that relate to permanency (such as the state budget).
- CYC has budgeted to have regular youth attendance at the Task Force. However, their budget only allows two youth to attend (attendees are paid a stipend). CYC would like other youth across the state to have opportunity to participate. Jude Koski wondered whether individual counties/agencies would be able to sponsor a youth. In counties where there is a CYC chapter, the money could be sent to the chapter, thus allowing older members (22 and over) to attend. Several Task Force members expressed interest; Koski will send stipend details to Eileen Johnson for distribution to the Task Force.
- The Task Force could help with more relationship building on the local level. Koski would like to see individual counties connect more with their local CYC chapters.

- Jennifer Rodriguez asked if there was some way to bring youth together from across the state/nationwide in a manner similar to first convenings, because she felt the best way to convince youth regarding the importance of permanency is to hear from other youth. Another purpose of the gathering would be to show youth how to advocate for themselves. A concern was raised whether youth would be given false expectations by this experience, in the event that their individual counties wouldn't follow through with the work.

#### **Action Items:**

- Koski will send stipend details to Eileen Johnson for distribution to the Task Force. COMPLETED.
- Agenda item for the next meeting: What part of CYC's recommendations can the Task Force help with?

#### **CPYP/Task Force Future – Bob Friend, CPYP**

- CPYP had been exploring the possibility of applying for a federal Family Connection Discretionary Grant in partnership with some other agencies. However, due to the state budget crisis, potential sources for matching funds disappeared. (The grant required a 25% match in funds for the first two years, and 50% for the third year). Since no additional funding has been found, CPYP as an entity will end on January 31, 2010.
- Ken Berrick, Seneca Center, has approached Bob Friend about the possibility of the work continuing through the Seneca Center for Family Finding and Lifelong Connections (SCFFLC), which is the center that Kevin Campbell works from. A grant has been submitted to the Stuart Foundation for transition/integration money. Under the current proposal, which is still under consideration, CPYP would be folded into the SCFFLC. The focus would be more national, but there is interest from both parties to continue to have a focus on California.
- Support to continue with the Task Force has been written into the proposed funding.

#### **Next Task Force Meeting**

- October 27, 2009, 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. was proposed, but the date needed to be confirmed.
- **Post-meeting update: NEW MEETING DATE is Thursday, November 5, 2009, 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., Elihu M. Harris State Building, Oakland.**