

# Resource Family Approval (RFA) - Project Management Team (PMT)

## Conference Call / Webinar Meeting Minutes

February 6, 2014 · 10:00 – 12:00

---

### **PURPOSE OF MEETING**

- San Luis Obispo and Kings to share about the implementation process
  - Discuss Data Elements, CWS/CMS, RFA Forms
- 

### **PARTICIPANTS**

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)  
Consortium for Children  
County Welfare Directors Association  
Kings County

San Francisco County  
San Luis Obispo County  
Santa Barbara County  
Santa Clara County

---

### **Greetings and Introductions**

#### **CDSS Updates:**

- CDSS has been attending different groups discussing and answering questions regarding RFA.
  - ICPC quarterly meeting
  - State Adoptions District meeting
  - ICWA workgroup
  - Working on Satisfaction Survey to send out for feedback.

### **Implementation Process**

#### **Kings County – Implementation began January 15, 2014**

- Susan Turner reported out on King's experience since beginning implementation on January 15, 2014.
- They have 5 workers in the RFA unit and are hoping to have all workers learn all jobs pertaining to RFA.
- Spent time converting existing forms into "RFA forms," including Spanish versions, and stated that they are willing to email these out to the other counties.
- 17 applications so far (2 withdrawals and 1 denial so far)
- Working on ways to organize their work without having a network yet.
- On 1/15/14 there were 11 relative/NREFM's already in process. Those with background checks completed as of 1/15 are doing old process, others are doing RFA process.

#### **San Luis Obispo County- Implementation began November 1, 2013**

- They are conducting one PRIDE session a month. Attendance is good.
- They have combined relative and non-relative applicants in all sessions and are receiving positive feedback about the PRIDE sessions from relatives.

**Resource Family Approval (RFA) - Project Management Team (PMT)**  
**Conference Call / Webinar Meeting Minutes**  
**February 6, 2014 · 10:00 – 12:00**

- Had the following question: Is it a conflict of interest if an adoption worker (from contracted adoption agency) does the complete home approval and not just the psycho/social assessment and later wants to place a child in the home?
  - Licensing clearly states that they are to be separate. If you did the licensing/approval of a home then you cannot place a child in the home.
  - For RFA we need to look into this further to see whether or not this is a problem.
- They have converted many established LIC and SOC forms into RFA forms.
  - This is allowable unless it is a state mandated form. State mandated forms cannot be changed or altered.

**Data Elements**

- Counties were emailed a DRAFT copy of a Data Elements spreadsheet prior to webinar.
- Feedback on spreadsheet included:
  - Add “Other” to relationship choices
  - Have drop down menus for choices within a category.
  - Be able to identify each individual applicant as it relates to their education level and ethnicity.
  - Do we want a column for results of Fair Hearing?
  - Add a column for “Primary Language” in the home.
  - Add a column to capture “Permanency Outcomes.”
  - In the complaint column clarify what we want to capture: substantiated complaints, open complaints, unfounded complaints, serious incidents etc.
- CDSS will be adding a column for “Date Child Was Placed.”
- CDSS will include a cover letter with instructions once spreadsheet is finalized and distributed.
- Discussed what counties are able to capture this data for RFA homes?
  - San Luis Obispo -Yes
  - Santa Barbara indicated it is data they already collect.
  - Santa Clara-Yes
  - Kings- is capturing the data for relatives (copying and pasting info into CWS/CMS) and working on a way to organize data for all other Resource Families
  - San Francisco – Did not indicate if they are able to or not.
- CDSS will schedule a meeting ASAP to include county points of contact and their identified data people along with people from CDSS’s Data Systems and Survey Design Bureau to discuss moving forward with capturing the identified data elements.

**CWS/CMS**

- CDSS and county partners are in the process of developing a new CWS/CMS that will include relevant fields for RFA. Will also look at the addition of RFA forms as well.

# Resource Family Approval (RFA) - Project Management Team (PMT)

## Conference Call / Webinar Meeting Minutes

### February 6, 2014 · 10:00 – 12:00

- An emergency placement is not yet an approved RFA home and cannot be selected as RFA in CWS/CMS. What do you select?
  - SLO currently enters home as relative and once approved moves it to RFA.
  - When assigning a number to a family, SLO puts RFF or RFP for probation in front of number to identify them.
- CDSS will schedule a meeting with county points of contact and their identified data people to discuss data elements and CWS/CMS as it relates to RFA.

### Forms

- All RFA forms are on the Extranet. Two of the form links, RFA 03 and 05 are not live yet. A link will be sent out when the forms are available that incorporates the changes made.
- Discussed forms that would be good to have converted to “RFA friendly” forms and picked the top three to begin with:
  - SOC 815 Approval of Family Caregiver Home
  - LIC 198B Out-Of-State Child Abuse/Neglect Report Request
  - LIC 624 Unusual Incident/Injury Report
- Some of the other identified forms are:
  - LIC 9108 Statement Acknowledging Requirement to Report Child Abuse
  - LIC 610B Emergency Plan for Foster Family Homes
  - LIC 613 Personal Rights
- CDSS currently working on developing an RFA version of the NA1271 (Fair Hearing Notice of Action.) Counties were asked not to use the current form for RFA homes that are NOT relative families.
- On RFA application, page 3, section VII, Kings County expressed that they would like to see a column added for “child’s name.” CDSS will look into adding this if it isn’t a concern for legal.
- A request was made to clarify language regarding the completion of Home and Ground Assessment on the RFA -03 form. CDSS will look into it.
- Reminder was given regarding State mandated forms cannot be changed or altered.

### Topics of Discussion

- Discussed when to use “**compelling reason**” for a placement.
  - Keeping sibling group together
  - Special needs that require specific skill set
  - Clarified that it is an exception, not general practice, and that it is important to take a good look and ascertain what the compelling reason is.
- Discussed the use of **ORI numbers** and making sure that counties have permission to use “adoption” for applicant type with DOJ if they don’t currently have two ORI numbers for their county (one for adoption and one for all other approvals). Per statute it is mandatory that RFA families obtain an adoption clearance.
- **Non-ambulatory** does NOT apply to infants, [Foster Family Home Homes, Title 22 Section 89420(a)(1)]

**Resource Family Approval (RFA) - Project Management Team (PMT)**  
**Conference Call / Webinar Meeting Minutes**  
**February 6, 2014 · 10:00 – 12:00**

- Need clarification on **Capacity** limits for relatives. Will cross reference statute and how it is noted in the Written Directives.

**Group Agreements**

- Agreed to have PMT conference call/webinar meetings once a month.

**Next Steps**

- Asked counties to begin keeping a list of items they want to see added into or changed in the next version of the Written Directives.
- Santa Clara to begin implementation May 31, 2014, but would prefer more time.
- San Francisco stated they were going to begin implementation on May 1, 2014.
- We will have our next conference call/webinar on March 20, 2014, 10am-12pm. Webinar invite will be emailed out prior to meeting.

Be sure to access the extranet for RFA forms, and MOU and Implementation templates. Please submit any comments and/or questions via email to [RFA@dss.ca.gov](mailto:RFA@dss.ca.gov).

---