



**LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMISSION
FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES**
Celebrating 26 Years of Advocacy & Achievement

COMMISSIONERS

Patricia Curry
Chair

Susan F. Friedman
Vice Chair

Steven M. Olivas, Esq.
Vice Chair

Stacey Savelle
Vice Chair

Genevra Berger
Carol O. Biondi
Ann Franzen
Dr. Sunny Kang
Helen A. Kleinberg
Dr. La-Doris McClaney
Rev. Cecil L. Murray
Sandra Rudnick
Adelina Sorkin, LCSW/ACSW
Martha Trevino Powell
Dr. Harriette F. Williams

APPROVED MINUTES

The Meeting of the Commission for Children and Families was held on Monday, **January 10, 2011**, in Room 739 of the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles. **Please note that these minutes are intended as a summary and not as a verbatim accounting or transcription of events at this meeting.**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT (Quorum Established)

Genevra Berger	Rev. Cecil L. Murray
Carol O. Biondi	Steven M. Olivas, Esq.
Patricia Curry	Sandra Rudnick
Ann Franzen	Stacey Savelle
Susan F. Friedman	Adelina Sorkin, LCSW/ACSW
Dr. Sunny Kang	Martha Trevino Powell
Dr. La-Doris McClaney	Dr. Harriette F. Williams

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT (Excused/Unexcused)

Helen A. Kleinberg

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Curry at 10:10 a.m.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

Self introductions were made.

III. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

- **January 10, 2011**

Action Taken:

On motion of Commissioner Trevino-Powell, seconded by Commissioner Kang (Commissioner Kleinberg being absent), the agenda for January 10, 2011, was unanimously approved.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- **December 13, 2010**

Action Taken:

On motion of Commissioner Williams, seconded by Vice Chair Olivas (Commissioner Kleinberg being absent), the December 13, 2010 minutes ([copy on file](#)) were unanimously approved, as submitted.

V. CHAIR'S REPORT

Chair Curry reported the following:

- Ms. Genevra Berger, representing the Fifth District, was appointed to the Commission by Mayor Michael D. Antonovich on January 4, 2011.

The Commission welcomed Ms. Berger to the Commission.

- Deputy Executive Officer Don Ashton is leaving the County.

The Commission thanked Mr. Ashton for his hard work and wished him continued success.

- Commissioner McClaney will be honored as the Woman of the Year in the Business/Labor category by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and the Commission for Women, on March 14, 2011, at the Biltmore Hotel. For more information on the [26th Annual "Women of the Year" Awards Luncheon](#), please log onto www.laccw.info.

The Commission congratulated Commissioner McClaney on this prestigious recognition.

- Acting DCFS Director Ms. Antonia Jimenez has designated Dr. Jackie Contreras as the Commission's liaison to DCFS. Dr. Contreras will provide the Director's report at future Commission meetings. Furthermore, in an email to the Commission, Ms. Jimenez stressed the importance of continuity between DCFS and the Commission.

Action Taken:

After discussion, by common consent and there being no objection, Chair Curry's verbal report was received and filed.

VI. PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSIONS

**a. Update on DCFS' Prevention Initiative
Demonstration Project**

**Marilynn Garrison, DCFS
Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey,
USC School of Social Work**

Presenters, Marilynn Garrison, Jacqueline McCroskey and Corey Hanemoto reported the following:

- The Los Angeles County's Prevention Initiative Demonstration Project (PIDP) is a four-year project that was designed to address the full spectrum of child abuse prevention including primary prevention approaches directed to the whole community as well as secondary and tertiary approaches directed to families already referred to or engaged with the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS). Family participation in PIDP is strictly voluntary.
- PIDP just completed its second year of the initiative, and in December 2010, the Board of Supervisors (Board) voted to approve the final two years of PIDP. However, PIDP funding is expected to be less than the previous two years.

Ms. McCroskey, one of the evaluators of PIDP, provided the Commission with the PIDP's year-two research of findings ([copy on file](#)), as well as the executive summary of year-two evaluation report ([copy on file](#)) which is the most comprehensive study ever sponsored by DCFS.

In response to questions posed by the Commission, Ms. Garrison, Ms. McCroskey and Mr. Hanemoto added the following:

- Lessons learned from the first two years of the PIDP will be considered in 2012 when many DCFS contracts are up for renewal. More in-depth evaluations of programs are necessary to ensure that only successful programs are continued.
- Funding for PIDP was at \$5 million for its initial year, with a plan to reduce that amount by \$1.25 million each subsequent year. In its second year the Chief Executive Office and the Board covered the anticipated \$1.25 million reductions to PIDP. Only \$2.5 million will be available in the third year of PIDP resulting in a reduction of services to families.
- Currently there are no plans to provide additional funding for PIDP. Acting DCFS Director Ms. Jimenez is aware of the impact of reduced services.
- If DCFS is unable to provide additional funds for PIDP, perhaps other County Departments that impact children and families can leverage cuts by providing assistance.

- DCFS has been actively working with all agencies involved with family sustainability to seek additional funding opportunities. For example, Mr. Hanemoto was instrumental in connecting two of the DCFS visitation managers with the Ahmanson Foundation, which has resulted in a \$25,000 grant opportunity and the continued interest of the Foundation to further funding the DCFS visitation centers.
- The PIDP evaluation focused on Emergency Response (ER) referrals and exits from foster care. However, re-entries were not evaluated as extensively as the number of families with re-entry referrals has been relatively small.
- One of the evaluators of PIDP, Mr. Todd Franke, conducted a sub-study that was focused on two visitation centers located in the South County and in Torrance during the first year of PIDP. The sub-study revealed that one of the visitation centers used paid monitors instead of volunteers; however, it was determined that the volunteer approach provided better outcomes.
- Unfortunately, time constraints prevented the development of a projected cost savings analysis for PIDP, however, such an analysis would be a great component of next evaluation process.

Action Taken:

After discussion, by common consent and there being no objection, this item was received and filed.

b. Update on DCFS' Family Preservation Program **Marilynn Garrison, DCFS**
Naftali Sampson, DCFS

Ms. Garrison and Mr. Sampson reported the following:

- DCFS' Family Preservation Unit served 4,535 families and 10,146 children in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008/09. Family Preservation services are completely voluntary, and DCFS offers Family Preservation services to the Family Maintenance (FM) and Family Reunification (FR) population of DCFS. Of the 10,146 children that received Family Perseveration services, 8,924 were FM population and 1,222 were FR population.
- In FY 2009/10 DCFS' Family Preservation Unit served 5,063 families and 11,341 children. Of the 11,341 children, 10,206 were from FM population and 1,135 were from the FR population.
- Various services funded by Family Preservation include:
 - Clinical Case Management: An in-home outreach counselor will visit the family four times a month.
 - Parent Training: Which can be done at home or in a group session format.

- Teaching and Demonstrating: Teaching basic home keeping skills, developing a basic budget.
 - Transportation: To and from contracted service providers.
 - Substitute Adult Role Modeling: Provides a role model for children interested in becoming, for example a police officer, scientist or teacher, who may not otherwise have that opportunity at home. The role model is usually a volunteer from within the community, however in the future they may receive a stipend. DCFS monitors the role models by conducting site visits and review the case files and notes. The role models are expected to record case notes on the child, which assist in determining if any progress has been made.
 - Counseling: The Family Preservation unit provides counseling distinct from the Clinical Case Management in home outreach counseling.
 - Emergency Housing: Provides temporary and short term housing, such as hotels. The timeframe for emergency housing may be extended with DCFS approval.
 - Employment Services Training: The services referenced are via Linkages which provided employment training and self-help support groups.
 - Auxiliary Funds: Provides funds for families to obtain household items such as beds, tables, refrigerators. Funds are also available for first and last month's rent.
 - Substance Abuse and Treatment: Provides substance abuse and treatment services.
- Family Preservation receives Federal funding through Promoting Safe and Stable Families Program paid by the Social Security Act (Title IV-B), County matching dollars, and State dollars designated for Family Preservation. In addition, reinvestment dollars from the Title IV-E have been applied to Family Preservation.
 - The total amount of funding for Family Preservation this year is approximately 37 million dollars. Of that \$37 million, approximately \$11.5 million is reinvestment dollars and last fiscal year it was approximately \$8.3 million dollars.

In response to questions posed by the Commission, Ms. Garrison and Mr. Sampson added the following:

- Although there are similarities between mentoring and DCFS' Family Preservation Substitute Adult Role Modeling program, mentoring usually occurs over an extended period of time.
- The expectation is that the contracted agencies of DCFS are responsible for securing volunteers and role models.

- The Probation Department receives approximately 14.3 percent of the Family Preservation funds. However, the Title IV-E reinvestment dollars are reserved strictly for DCFS.
- DCFS is reviewing its partnerships with other County departments in an effort to better utilize services that already exist which can potentially allow DCFS to utilize those funds in other areas. For example, DCFS has already partnered with Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) via the Linkages initiative in which a DPSS Gain worker is co-located in a DCFS office.

The next step is bringing DPSS to the table with the Family Preservation agencies to explore the feasibility of leveraging of funds, by consolidating services to families and eliminating duplications. Additional opportunities for increased collaboration among County departments and agencies are also underway.

- DCFS' Family Preservation Program was last evaluated in 2005, by Barbara Solomon.

Action Taken:

After discussion, by common consent, and there being no objection, this item was received and filed. Additionally, the DCFS Family Preservation Program staff was instructed to return to the Commission's meeting scheduled for February 7, 2011, to report back on the following questions posed by the Commission:

1. How is the 11.5 million reinvestment dollars distributed by SPA?
The response should indicate whether there is an equitable distribution of funds based on caseload size. For example, does SPA 6 receive the greatest allocation? Which service providers are located in each SPA, and what is the dollar amount each receives?
2. How do the FR and FM cases relate to Front End and Back End cases?
3. How many cases are court-ordered for Family Preservation services?
4. What is the average length of time a family receives Family Preservation services?
5. In terms of counseling services, are Mental Health dollars being accessed?
6. There is a finite amount of Auxiliary funds. Do DCFS and contract agencies access faith-based organization to access items being requested or needed by families?

VII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

There was none.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Debra Reid, Cynthia Swiney, Quanya Sanders, La Tonya Turner Payton, and Raymond H. Payton, addressed the Commission.

General Commission Meeting

January 10, 2011

Page 7 of 7

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There was none.

X. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Curry at 12:06 p.m.