**CFYETF**

**Notes**

**June 16, 2014**

**Participants: Jesse Hahnel, Michelle Francois-Traiman, Patty Armani, Melissa San Miguel, Leecia Welch, Lauren C, Juliana F, Susanna Kniffen, Ann Quirk, Angela Vasquez, Danielle Mole, Martha Matthews, Judy Morrison, Sonja House, Corby Sturges, Anjanette, Julie, Michelle Lustig, Lacy Lenon Arthur, Casey Schutte, Laurie Kappe, Jill Sevaaetasi, Rachel Velcoff Hultz, Maura Keaney, Karie Lew, Lisa Guillen, Heidi Braums, Lori Fuller, Heather Wilson, Jessica Haspel**

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

An AB 167 / 216 Special Ed agenda item and a discussion on adult schools and charter schools have been added to the Updates section.

**II. Ed Summit Discussion**

Many members advocated for an annual Summit. The LCFF presents a real opportunity to expand our audience. Legislators could be invited to the event.

The fall is the beginning of the school year, but if it is held in the fall the legislative component becomes more difficult as the members are back in their districts. Logistically, the fall of this year would be difficult, but we will move conversations forward regarding a Spring 2015 Summit.

Advantages to a spring date – legislative advocacy, we would need a date ASAP, data from reports – schools would be able to look at their past LCAP goals

Mia will blast out an email to AB 490 liaisons to encourage school staff to get involved with the Task Force.

It was suggested that we reach out to Child Welfare, the CSBA, ASCA

**III. LCFF Conversation**

Foster Youth Definition:

Karie Lew shared that many stakeholders she works with in San Mateo County are very concerned about probation youth being included under the definition of foster youth.

LCFF definition (code 42238.01) was amended to make the LCFF definition narrower and less inclusive than 48853.5. The new LCFF definition of foster youth does not include probation youth at home or in locked-facilities. The FYS definition is even narrower, and does not include youth living with relatives. When thinking about the definitions we should consider homeless youth as well.

The new LCFF definition lines up the LCFF definition with the Title IVE definition for eligibility for federal funding.

Those working to implement LCFF were tasked with identifying youth and ran into difficulties with some categories of probation youth.

It was suggested that we conduct a survey where folks can indicate what youth they serve now.

Next year we can focus on clarifying what county offices are supposed to do.

Susanna and others are working with the administration to align the definition of foster youth in LCFF with the definition in the FYS statutes, and we may see something regarding this in the January budget. They are committed to changing the definition.

What should the definitions be? This can be discussed on a separate call with a subgroup. If you are interested in joining a group to attempt to come to a consensus on a definition, please let Mia know. An email will go out shortly.

LCAP (District) Updates:

San Diego- They are experiencing every end of the spectrum.

Santa Cruz – Casey has only seen one LCAP from the district with half of all the foster youth in the county. Foster youth were not included in the LCAP. They had a very difficult time getting foster youth represented at the town hall/feedback sessions.

San Mateo – Anjanette has seen several LCAPs. They have diverse districts, some have flat funding, some have increases and some have decreases. The ones with FY concentrations have been successful in getting FY stakeholder input to get youth included in LCAPs. Coordinated services and enhancing services have been a focus.

Sonia – county offices of ed are guiding and helping districts to understand the need and why this is necessary. They are working on tweaking the LCAPS for next year.

Sacramento – the majority of the districts with the majority of FY have done a great job conducting outreach to try to get families, kids and stakeholders involved. Ann has seen the drafts and is pleased with the FY focus and the recommendations they included. The FY definition is very inclusive.

Shasta – They have worked with all the districts that have outreached for help. Their goal is that each site has a district liaison, and that a counselor at high schools have a foster youth focus. Their county office is working on a menu of services of resources for the districts.

Paramount Unified – adding two tutors and a trainer for school counselors. They are creating a CYC club at one of the high schools.

LA – Interesting patterns are starting to emerge. Some smaller districts are doing creative things – meetings with FY caregivers, paying testing fees. Different political strategies need to be employed to reach different audiences. Some are happy to work with advocates, and many have been receptive to the outreach by Patty Armani.

The Board of Supervisors plays a unique role in LA County. Desert school districts have large numbers of FY away from their home communities. Those districts have not historically been great working with FY and not receptive to coalition efforts. The Supervisor in this district has been able to mobilize efforts to get conversations going in that area.

LAUSD – Martha acknowledged the efforts of their coalition – Advancement Project, CYC, Alliance of Childrens Rights, FosterEd, etc. LAUSD does not have a school stability goal, which is concerning. The coalition is also concerned that the new FY counselors funded by LA unified (9 million to hire 70 new counselors) will focus on paperwork instead of working to actually help youth improve outcomes. They are working on their tendency to get bogged down with paper and plans. They are developing a 2 day training for FY counselors to help with this. Once fully developed the training may be shared.

Patty had an offline discussion with LAUSD regarding school stability. The district feels that stability is less a district problem and more a child welfare problem. They came to an agreement to develop protocols to change high rate of school transfers for FY. LAUSD and DCFS will do this work through a workgroup.

LCAP Research Questions:

The next round of legislative and administrative changes will be driven by what the LCAPs are saying. There are a significant number of organizations focused on analyzing LCAPs. We do not want to miss the boat.

Is there a list of common questions we can agree upon? What could have worked better? Engagement with districts/ counties? What should we be on the lookout for? We would like to engage with research organizations as policy makers are more likely to listen to research coming from researchers, rather than advocates.

Stuart Foundation is funding many investigations looking at LCAPs as a whole – broad looks at many districts and deep looks into a few districts. What do we want to know from an objective standpoint?

Jesse added that it’s important to acknowledge that an important piece is singling out 5-10 districts doing interesting things to provide to other districts as a reference.

* How many district LCAPS contract with COEs to provide services?
* Is the input provided at stakeholder meetings reflected in the LCAPs? (Transparency should be easy to measure.)
* Do the LCAPS include new people at the school site level? Are they actually creating new positions for people working with these populations? How will they be trained/supervised and how will the district support it? How many youth are they expected to serve?
* How do we identify appropriate metrics? What is the long-term outcome? (Goals should be tied to academics and % improvements in attendance, etc.)
* Districts not using $ on new staff – what are they using it on?
* How are schools going to prove that their goals have been met?
* How many LCAPs established partnerships with mental health?
* What does collaborative processes look at a site level?

Melissa and the LCFF Special Topic group will continue this conversation. If you would like to join, please let Mia/Melissa know so that you can be informed of call times, etc.

It was suggested to look at both LCAPs that look at academics/attendance, as well as those that look at things like mentoring and counseling (soft skills).

What are COE’s planning on doing?

* Plans to become A-G accredited?
* Offering AP courses? College prep?
* To what degree are they supplementing the program for youth that live with relatives?
* For FYS programs, is there alignment between data that is being collected? What do we want to measure?
* Consistency and alignment – how is the COE helping districts put these together?

**V. Updates**

AIG II Update:

The Co-Investment Partnership ([www.co-invest.org](http://www.co-invest.org)) started with a morning Capitol briefing (attended by 35 people), which included a presentation by Emily Putnam Hornsby on the AIG II report. The data was analyzed through a county lens, and in terms of type of placement. Laurie will forward the executive summary to Mia to share with the TF. A data presentation was held in the afternoon, which was also very well attended.

Fact Sheets:

8 of the 11 fact sheets are formatted and ready for final review. 3 sheets are currently being formatted and should be ready soon (ECE, Special Ed and Behavioral Assessments). Karie Lew is currently reviewing #s 1, 2, 9 and 10. Lacy will go through each sheet to make sure they are consistently formatted.

Jesse and the chairs took a moment to thank Karie, Lacy and the many others that have worked so hard to complete these sheets.

Budget and Leg:

Relative equity – now youth living with relatives will receive a foster care rate, not a CalWORKS rate. It’s county option. Sufficient funding will cover the families that are not federally eligible.

CWDA put in a request for dollars for counties to work with CSEC youth. The budget allocated 5 million towards this for this year. There is a provision that CSE youth can be served in the dependency system assuming their parents were unable to ….

SEIU asked for counties to start tracking caseload data in individual counties.

Group homes are no longer able to employ those under age 21. This applies to new group home staff hired after October 1st.

There was no additional funding in the budget to reduce dependency caseloads

See Susanna’s bill list.

AB 1441: Partial credits. We will revisit this next year and see if it can go a couple steps further.

AB 1878: Foster care data: Died. We may want to come back and make this more focused next year.

AB 2276: Pupils in juvenile court schools: Still moving

SB 1023: Creates EOPS for FY on CC campuses: Scaled back to a pilot program in 10 community college districts. 5 million have been put aside. The Chancellors office will create an application process for districts to apply.

SB 1296: Decriminalizing truancy/ keeping courts from confining truants for not attending school.

1346: Effort to get this back in failed.

AB 167/216 Discussion

Youth that chose to graduate (diploma) under 216 disqualify themselves from receiving special education benefits through age 22.

Applicability of adult schools and charter schools varies across the state at adult schools. The SPI’s Office has released guidance indicated that AB 216 applies to charter schools.

Many districts are adopting integrated math due to common core. How are youth meeting requirements for A-G when their schools are offering integrated math (not Algebra I, Geometry and Algebra II). Lisa at DSS will connect with adult ed to see if they have any guidance regarding this.

We will continue the AB 167/216 discussion after receiving some clarification regarding graduation/special ed assistance and math/common core.

**VI. Special Topics Updates**

School Discipline:

Kim Parker from Elk Grove Unified SD has filled Katherine McLaughlin’s place as co-chair for the School Discipline group. They are still currently working on identifying meaningful alternatives to expulsion. Martha recommended fixschooldiscipline.org. If any TF members have observed any successful practices, please let Dan know. He would also be interested in thoughts on how existing school discipline efforts could be adapted for foster youth.

School Stability:

Still working on the video, and have interviewed several youth. Patrick Hirsch will be doing the editing. The group could still use any youth you know that have experienced school instability due to foster care placements.

Ed Advocacy:

They are focusing on putting together new training materials on the most relevant changes to the Rules of Court. They are compiling a document on the rules themselves, and the other forms related to it. They have also explored judicial training on the forms and what they can do to supplement that. Corby Sturges has joined the group, and has helped to provide history and background to help make sense of the changes.

Early Care and Education:

We just wrapped up our survey of child welfare agencies and service agencies to identify barriers that our infants and toddlers face in accessing early intervention and education services.  The main issues we’ve found were that the service agency didn’t know who held ed rights when a child was referred, or they didn’t have accurate contact information, couldn’t get in touch with social worker, didn’t have all the documents they needed, and concerns about confidentiality.

 We’re working on creating a toolkit of information that will help agencies across the state improve their referral processes.  This has been a years-long project that we’ve been working on in LA and we’ve had some success improving the referral process, specifically to regional centers, so we’re hoping to replicate that in other counties.

LCFF:

The LCAP template is likely to be formally be adopted this summer at the July SBE hearing. If you would like to participate in the LCAP review process, let Mia and Melissa know.

Post Secondary Education:

They had been working on included FY in equity planning templates for community colleges. This will be distributed soon. Their next calls will be on a policy road map to post secondary education, and the EOPS program for foster youth.

**VII. Next Steps and Close**

Michelle Francois will be joining the TF as a Chair starting August 1st. Patty, Jesse and Lacy will remain co-chairs as well. This provides leadership from the perspective of Child Welfare, County Office of Education, Advocacy and now Foundations.

Our next conference call will take place on July 14th from 3 – 4:30 PM.