

# Minutes of the Community Advisory Council Meeting

Monday, March 8<sup>th</sup>, 2021 \* 6:30 pm-8:30pm

## Virtual MS TEAMS Meeting

**PRESENT:** Community Members: Leroy Clarke, Raphael Francis, Renee Whittaker, Blessing Morka, Karen Chen, Sandra Forsythe, Veralyn Alleyne  
 Board Members: Robert Royer, Gabrielle Provencher, Aisha Delpeache (connection problems)  
 Staff Members: Steve Woodman, Dawn Walcott-Parris, Amanda Colacicco, Cheryl Green (Recorder), Andrea Maenza (guest), Max Kryukov (guest)

Item	Item Discussion	Action / Decisions	Responsibility
1.	<p><b>Welcome: Land Acknowledgement &amp; CAC Statement</b>            The meeting commenced at 6:32pm. Quorum was met. The Land Acknowledgement was read by Steve Woodman. The CAC Statement was read by Veralyn Alleyne. Moving forward, it was suggested to add the Land Acknowledgement and the CAC Statement to the agenda package, and omit the Terms of Reference and Suggested Meeting Guidelines (as these documents can be found on the CAC Portal). Cheryl G. to begin this process with the April agenda package.</p>		
2.	<p><b>Approval of Agenda</b>            Veralyn requested an item be added to the agenda – the Child Welfare Redesign Project (mentioned in the Briefing Note). Attendees agreed to add an additional 10 minutes to the meeting to discuss the project, and move Max’s agenda item to after the Building Bridges item</p>	Decision to approve the agenda of March 8th, 2021. MOTIONED by Leroy Clarke and SECONDED by Amanda Colacicco with the changes. CARRIED	
3.	<p><b>Declaration of Conflict of Interest</b>            There were no declarations of conflict of interest.</p>		
4.	<p><b>Approval of Minutes</b>            In the February minutes on page #3 (under the Privacy Breach Protocol agenda item) a typo was noticed; 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet from the top, ‘by’ should be changed to ‘be’. Cheryl G. to make the correction. There are several sets of minutes missing on both the Portal and the DCAS website. Is it possible to add them? Cheryl G. and Amanda C. will work on this task and update the sites.</p>	MOTIONED by Sandra Forsythe and SECONDED by Karen Chen to approve the minutes of February 8th, 2021 with the change. CARRIED.	

<p>5.</p>	<p><b>Building Bridges Strategic Planning Consultation</b>  Suggested to defer the Building Bridges (BB) event for a few weeks to ensure the Strategic Plan Consultant would be in place and an active participating leader for the BB session. This is a very important part of the Strategic Planning process and DCAS would like to ensure the consultant is able to meet with BB community attendees. In a just over a week, the Strategic Planning group will be presented with possible candidates to select from, which they will then ask to submit to the RFP. The consultant would most likely be hired by the first week of April, as the Strategic Plan will be presented to the Board the end of May. Council members noted their concern for the tight turnaround between hiring the consultant and the BB event. The council decided to confirm an event date through a doodlepoll (sent out by Amanda C.) with end of April/early May options. The promotional logistics can be started once a date is confirmed; it is optional to have at least 3 weeks to promote the event. It was suggested to have a different platform for the event (this is started as a discussion item on the portal). Visual advertising drafts will be posted on the portal as well.</p>		
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Standing Item: OVOV – Implementation/Work Plan Update</b>  Please see the briefing note for more information. The deliverables can be seen in the work plan and are on target with timing for March and June. Amanda is able to include more detail in the next briefing note. The OVOV contract position decision has been made with an offer to the chosen candidate going out on Wednesday. The AOP DEI Director position has been short listed to two with the second round of interviews to begin.</p> <p>Veralyn and Renee attended the February Board meeting. Trite reporting and supporting data were discussed at the meeting. There is a deliverable in the OVOV work plan/practice 2 specific to data. The preliminary discussions on trite reporting data collection included focusing it as an AOP DEI responsibility. During an upcoming internal meeting with the Trite Reporting Policy work group, Dawn, Jodi Potts and Alex Constantin, there will be discussion around collecting and analyzing trite reporting data differently than service data as CPIN does not support trite reporting as an indicator. DCAS is not looking to just measure incidents of trite reporting, but also problematic patterns (particular schoolboard, caregiver, etc.). The service pathway data will be a deliverable to the Service Quality and Outcomes Committee by June 1<sup>st</sup>.</p>		
<p>7.</p>	<p><b>Caregiver Presentation; Kinship Process/ Supports</b>  Highlights of Max's presentation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Out of Home Placement Priority is: immediate or extended family; Kith; foster families within child's community of origin; foster families of the same region; foster families of the same racial, cultural or linguistic group as child (outside of region); former caregivers; other placement resources</li> <li>• Children placed with family members experience more stability and better outcomes (decrease in days in care; less likely for placement disruption; higher rate of re-unification; and lower levels of overall behaviour programs)</li> </ul>		

- Priority is permanency for the child through a continuous, long term stable family environment
- Kinship Service
  - Child not in care of society
  - Voluntary placement
  - Assessment of proposed kin to ensure safety
  - Family assisted to access community supports
  - Episodic financial support as needed on a short term basis
- Kinship Care
  - Child in care of society
  - Proposed home meets same licensing requirements as foster homes (PRIDE)
  - Providers receive daily per diem from DCAS
- Supports available to all Kin caregivers
  - Kinship service worker support
  - Initial and ongoing training
  - Services to meet child's needs
  - Transportation to child support service
  - Caretaker relief
  - Tutoring for children
  - Legal support
  - Clinical support (SOS family conferencing; counselling; etc.)
  - COVID-19 funding supplement
- Supports available to Kin Service caregivers
  - Child care
  - Assistance obtain identity documentation
  - Episodic/emergency financial assistant
  - Funding for immediately available items (ex furniture, etc.)
  - Payments for accommodations to meet needs of child

Question – When looking at the flowchart, please clarify the assessments taken at each step. The Initial assessment is about the child and the family; the result of that assessment may result in the child being moved from their original home. There is a more complex, comprehensive assessment (more structured approach) at the 7-day step. The child is also assessed numerous times during their involvement with CAS. Council members suggested to name the assessments to differentiate the types of assessment that is occurring (Initial, Safety, Kin, etc.).

Question – How do you know that SOS is effective and that it works? SOS includes a Family Network Conference; this is where the agency brings family/kin together to provide the child with a voice and work together to provide the best options for the child moving forward. There is recent research that questions the success of SOS, however, the framework and model is only as good as the fidelity of its implementation. The fundamental principle of SOS is the shift of more family involvement; the more

<p>family members that are involved allows us to find creative solutions that keep children within their networks. There is present data that supports that SOS does work and is the best for the child.</p> <p>Question – How do you decide on placement fairly without ABR influences/personal bias? No one individual has the power to make the decision to remove a child; it is a decision made between a worker(s) and their supervisor(s). Personal bias does exist; DCAS is working to help people recognize their personal bias. The QA department is working more and more with data to determine disproportionality in service areas and any patterns that exist. The practice model of SOS is, as much as possible, leaving the family to make the decisions, rather than child welfare workers making the decisions for the families. The AO/AR department exists to support families that have a disproportionate representation in child welfare and unearth individual bias and structural inequities.</p> <p>Question - What sort of checks and assessments are used to ensure a child is safe? The Home Safety (dwelling) Checklist is a standardized document; Max will forward this to Cheryl G. to share with the group. A Criminal Record Check and prior child welfare check are also completed; this is initially declared by the family/caregiver and then checked by DCAS more formally. Suggested that DCAS develop checklists for workers to follow to not deviate or bring in personal biases.</p> <p>Question - With regards to the 'out of home placement priorities', why does 'region' trump 'culture' when deciding on placement for a child? This is done to prevent disruption in a child's day-to-day living (school, friends, sport activities, church, neighbourhood); the change in placement is different but the environment remains the same. This does not minimize the importance of culture. Is there an opportunity to change this priority or assess differently? Instead of one factor being better than the other, it could be assessed together taking into account the voice of the child. OVOV states that racial continuity is above community continuity. There are many other factors to consider including sexual and gender identity, and rules and regulations of community organizations (example school boards). Using data to support practices is moving away from the numerical order of things; decolonize the data. Child welfare has undervalued racial/cultural matching; it is an evolving area that we need to pay attention to.</p> <p>Question - Do workers re-evaluate child placements? Assessments are an ongoing process for DCAS; the child's needs are constantly reassessed (well-being, connection built, safety). DCAS works to ensure that those pieces are heading in the right direction; if they are not, the agency must consider other options.</p> <p>For future consideration: How much money is spent per black child on additional support services vs. non-black children? Is there a discrepancy in the amounts? CAST has extra funding for black children for hair care; these practices do exist at DCAS as well (funding and training). Thank you to Max for attending.</p>		
---	--	--

	Council members would like to ensure that black people are represented in the list of resource and service providers.		
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>Historical African Canadian Child Welfare Intervention Services (AWCCWIS) Proposal/Collaboration</b>  Please see the PowerPoint included in agenda package for more information. A proposal was created to build services for the African Canadian community that worked alongside DCAS. Its intentions were to support and work with families that were involved with child welfare to achieve better outcomes for their children. The service was to offer culturally specific and relevant service. The staff body would address specific challenges for families (ex. parenting skills, therapeutic involvement, support through court system). The proposal was seeking funding with a thought to pilot the service with DCAS and the Toronto Children’s Catholic Aid Society. The program would not look at structural barriers or internal systemic biases/needed education; it was more focused on outcomes for families than disrupting the way in which child welfare worked. Question - Is it different than the black services team? Yes, black services team is within the agency and would be comprised of DCAS staff who identify as black and want to work with black families. The black services team would move the agency forward in terms of structural issues and barriers internally. Further discussion required; item deferred due to time constraints.</p> <p><u>The CIC Trend Line monthly report to Council</u>  We have had success in creating a trend line that shows the 21 year olds that are still receiving service &amp; youth under 21 as 2 separate lines. It was DCAS’s hope to provide this new report for this meeting, however, server issues prevented this today. Amanda will add it to the portal when it is available and advise when this has occurred.</p>		
<b>9.</b>	<b>Report of Child Protection Concerns –</b> Deferred to next meeting due to time constraints		
<b>10.</b>	<b>Black History Month Update –</b> Deferred to next meeting due to time constraints		
<b>11.</b>	<p><b>Community &amp; Agency Updates (CAC Portal Update)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require update on complaint policy at next meeting.</li> <li>• Aging out moratorium has been extended to September 2022.</li> </ul>		
<b>12.</b>	<p><b>Meeting Evaluation &amp; Adjournment</b>  There was no meeting evaluation. The meeting was adjourned at 8:41pm.</p>	MOTIONED by Sandra Forsythe and SECONDED by Dawn Walcott-Parris CARRIED.	