



DCF 57 Advisory Council Meeting

5.29.24 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

DCF Staff			
Name	Present	Name	Present
Jamie Genrich	x	Elaine Pridgen	
Katie Davis	x	Shelby McCulley	x
Dana Johnson	x	John Elliott	x
Kristie Buwalda	x	Amy Bryant	x
Mary Morse	x	Emily Erickson	x
Chuck Stephens	x	Jeanette Paules	x
Rachel Nilli			

Advisory Council Members		
Name	Present	Name
Lisa Pendleton	x	Winnebago County
Stephen Bedwell	x	Youth & Family Services
Emily Coddington	x	WAFCA
Marye Beth Dugan	x	Nehemiah Group Home
Dave Fretz	Excused	Forward Home for Boys
India Hansen	x	Office of Lived Experience - DCF
Amy Rodriguez	x	Department of Corrections
Dr. Murece Johnson	x	Moe's Transitional Living Center
Lisa Netterville	x	New Hope & Destiny Home II
Caylee Nichols	x	Positive Alternatives
Audra O'Connell	x	Walker's Point Group Home
Jennifer Pester	x	Office of Lived Experience
Jill Collins	x	Division of Milwaukee Child Protective Services

DCF 57 Advisory Council Meeting

May 29, 2024

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
VIRTUAL Meeting

Meeting Link:

<https://dcfwi.zoom.us/j/89128275377?pwd=c01mTHNJeDJlVGxyUzY4S2tsbW1JZz09>

Meeting ID: 891 2827 5377

Passcode: 899713

or dial in: +1 (312) 626-6799

AGENDA

(1:00-1:20) I. Call to Order, Welcome, and Introductions

- **Anyone may submit comments to changes they would like to see to the rule, at any time, to danal.johnson@wisconsin.gov and will be incorporated in public comments and revision work.**

(1:20-1:40) II. DCF 57 Statement of Scope & Project Timeline

- DCF shared the PowerPoint regarding the advisory council meetings and logistics, process of rule revision, Statement of Scope, topics out of scope, vision of the work, and project timeline.
- Question as to why rate regulation is out of scope. DCF responded that this is part of a larger system and would need to be its own work group/revision.

(1:40-1:55) III. Commitment & Goals

- DCF shared goals, charge for advisory council members, and inquired as to additional commitments and goals to be added to our work.
- **Question raised to the Advisory Council:** *What are the things you wish you could fix about DCF 57?*
 - Needs determination process; lots of calls and the process is confusing. Individuals seeking the process find it confusing.
 - Obtain a determination letter from Department of Corrections and it's challenging for DOC.
 - Youth get suspended and don't get support from the school districts. When schools find out a youth is in a group home, they suspend the youth so they don't have to provide care to the youth. Homeschooling is not authorized under DCF 57. School does not provide IEP services to youth who are suspended. Could group homes offer a school setting?
 - How the rule is interpreted is a challenge. As licensor agents change, there is different guidance based on the agents' interpretation. Can we add a checklist, so the group homes know what is to be expected so there is less "grey"?
 - Previously could provide care for teen parent and their child and there seem to be restrictions here now.
 - When my facility location changes/lease ends/new location/open a second location, the whole licensing process has to be completed, even if I just finished licensing.
 - Assessment and treatment planning section of work needs tailored dispositional order process. Goals should be aligned with MH professionals, school, etc. so goals are attainable and only giving a few goals and when goals are achieved celebrate success. Can there be uniformity in the number of plans and goals so that individuals are not working on multiple goals across service continuum?
 - Treatment plan section changes: How family is involved and adjusting to the youth's treatment needs should be reviewed. Discharge section? How do we transition youth to the home and success has been set up. How does rule help us improve this process? Learning is transferred to the home setting.

- YAC (Jill Collins reported) Group homes are group care settings that feel more institutionalized and compared them to mental health hospital. Youth felt like the staff were babysitters and not parenting the youth.
- Recognition with what the accrediting bodies are also asking for and work to align the regular monitoring; can the accreditation process meet the licensing and monitoring requirements? Room to replace standard monitoring visits for things like record keeping vs. safety and allow standard monitoring by the accrediting body which is then shared with the licensing team and the licensing team could follow up. DCF should have access to the accrediting body to verify that they have come back into compliance. Would relieve staff and licensors of duplication of efforts. Accreditation goes through everything and does a deep dive into serious incident reports, staff files, etc. and they spend a few days on site to review all documents. Could the licensors be involved with the accreditation site visit? Agencies who purchase services from group homes don't actually know what is already being monitored, so they can feel as though they have to check all the things as well.
- Communication between county and group homes needs to be improved.
- Currently complete two different background check forms because of a subtle difference, unsure why this could not be seamless. Birth certificates are sometimes missing. How can we improve communication between entities involved in the group home space?
- Rule is disorganized or duplicative by listing requirements in multiple sections; how can we better organize to ease referencing?
- Parts of the rule are duplicative, revise.
- Children under the age of 6 is in 2 sections. Could the section on kids under age 6 be eliminated keep the section which allows teen parents in group homes?
- Age 12 limitations. Kids are being referred by counties at younger ages. Suggestion to expand to allowing age 11 and get an exception for age 10. Ages 8-12 year old population have different needs than serving teens.
- *Should there be an age limit, age restrictions? Should there be difference licenses for serving particular populations based on age? What would guidance look like?* DCF asked Advisory Council to consider for future discussion.

IV. Break

(2:20) V. Commitment & Goals – Intended Impact to Partners & Family

- **Input from Advisory Council as goals in this section of the presentation.**
 - See people to feel more like they are in the work “together”. Share and collaborate on goals, assessments, etc. Focus on the kids and family we are serving.
 - Idea that nobody’s ideal situation is for a youth to be in a group home, and it serves a purpose. We want all kids to be connected to family and be a community member. Do “typical” teen activities and make it focused on “normalcy”.
 - Kids and families will be “Seen, value and heard”. How do we and dispel the myth of the “I gotcha” moment. Work together to make life better.

- *Are there areas of data that you want us to review in order to inform our decision making? Are services equitable for all youth?*
- **DEFINE THE WIN! Group discussion**
 - Staff are spending less time on paperwork and more time engaging with the residents.
 - Move to being more operational as a “home”; have more home feeling than institutional.
 - Make sure everybody clearly understands the rule.
 - Clarify who is responsible for what. Counties contract with multiple GH’s and reduce responsibility and role confusion.

(2:45-2:55) VI. DCF 57 Admissions & Discharges

- ***Are changes needed to (2m) to add clarity around how to address the custodial parent or expectant mother's child?*** No comment
- #7 under admissions health examination: Facilities that serve youth who are experiencing homelessness only have youth in placement for 7 days, so this is something they would never be in compliance.
- Add clarity that within 30 days into entering out of home care; instead of the way the rule is currently written. Write that a physical needs to be scheduled within 30 days or should this be written that the agency who placed the youth is responsible? If the youth is on medication the youth may be needs to be seen. Suggestion that instead of 30 days modify to 60 days within placement.
- Fix gendered language in rule.
- Clarify that the Voluntary Placement Agreement or court order applies to the minor parent’s child or expectant child; can be extended if resident and resident’s parent don’t agree. Who makes the final determination if resident and parent don’t agree. Does 48 address this? If a parent does not agree, then it is no longer considered a VPA.
- ***What would be the unintended consequences of changing (5) to be "A group home may admit a child 12 years of age or over."?***
- If we do not put them in the same room as other youth of different ages, we have not had any problems. Age does not apply to youth who are considered runaway or experiencing homelessness. Someone questioned why this rule should be different for group homes than shelters for the homeless.
- Chronological age and developmental age are not necessarily different, but we could consider using these two distinctions.
- If you have a wide range of ages in a group home, offering activities may be difficult to meet programming needs for all youth placed there. Highlight the child’s functioning. Focus on programming instead of age.
- DCF shared the age exception requests come in; sibling groups and GH can meet the needs but the child is younger.

VII. Next STEPS: Continue to review the admission, discharge sections of rule & start review of personnel section at the next Advisory Council meeting scheduled for June 26th, 1:00 – 3:00 pm via Zoom.

VIII. Adjourn