Child Abuse Prevention Council (CAPC) Meeting Minutes
Friday, August 6, 2021, 9am-11am

NOTE: This meeting is being agendized to allow CAPC Members, staff, and the public to participate in the meeting via teleconference, pursuant to the Governor’s Executive Order N-29-20 (March 17, 2020), available at the following link: https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/3.17.20-N-29-20-EO.pdf

Teleconference options to join Zoom meeting:
To join by web: https://zoom.us/j/98758606986?pwd=VmpTU28yR2V5ZnlZVVRocStmYkNpdz09
Meeting ID: 987 5860 6986     Passcode: 2021
To join meeting by phone: +16699009128, Meeting ID: 987 5860 6986

Call to Order. Welcome, roll call, introductions, team-building activity (Karleen Jakowski, 10 minutes)

- Meeting called to order at 9:01am.
- CAPC members/alternates on the call: Celina Alveraz, Victoria Zimmerle, Tracy Fauver, Sara Gavin, Rachelle Gayton, Cecilia Lopez, Karleen Jakowski, Marialsabel Mandujano, Rob Strange
- Others on the call: Gabrielle Meyer (YCCA), Nicole Hollingsworth (YCCA), Jeneba Lahai(YCCA), Vanessa Batres (YCCA)
- As part of the team building activity members were asked to share a win/wins for the week.

1. Action Item: Consider approval of the agenda and approve June 4, 2021 minutes (Karleen Jakowski) (Attachments A and B)
   - VOTE: Tracy motioned to approve agenda and June 4, 2021 meeting minutes. Sara seconded. All approved via roll call.

2. Public comment
   - No public comment.

3. Member announcements (10 minutes)
   - No member announcements.

4. Action Items (80 minutes total)
   a. Discuss CAPC membership/Bylaws and consider voting for 12th CAPC member (Karleen Jakowski) (15 minutes)
      - There was a strong recommendation in adding Tessa Smith to the CAPC
• There were previous concerns about over-representation of HHSA- Brian, Karleen, and Tessa.
  o Clarified bylaws- Article IV Section 1 which states- “Each member of the Council shall have one vote. Alternates may vote when they are representing an absent Member.”
  o Karleen wanted to ensure that everyone is aware of what the bylaws state.
  o Ensuring everyone has right information to move forward regarding voting and action items.
• Brian met with Tessa to discuss comfort since he is her supervisor and she said she will be honored to join the CAPC.
• Noted that Tessa is doing a lot of work in the County with regard to equity and inclusion.
• Karleen opened up the floor for any concerns- none noted.
• Karleen asked if someone wanted to make a motion.
  VOTE: Tracy motioned to make Tessa Smith 12th CAPC member. Sara seconded. All approved via roll call.
- Karleen mentioned that Tessa will be a great addition to the CAPC as she brings a wealth of experience to the group and confirmed that her role is under community representative.

b. Review 2020-21 CAPC survey and outcomes and give direction on 2021-22 CAPC priorities (25 minutes)
  • Review 2020-2021 CAPC Survey (Karleen Jakowski) (Attachment C)
  - Vanessa shared CAPC Survey Results for 2020-2021
  - Karleen reviewed CAPC survey results for 2020-2021
  - First section #1-11:
    - Karleen commented that for item #6- “We are able to manage conflict successfully,” she feels there has been progress in that area compared to previous years.
    - Overall, overwhelmingly positive results for these items.
  - Karleen: Noted that for item #10, “I am satisfied with our external communication with stakeholders” may be a potential area of focus.
  - Karleen paused for feedback- none noted.
  - Chief Strange commented that an outreach subcommittee (if developed) would help with that. He appreciates the CAPC and how open everyone is as they are trying to grow in the area of communication and community participation.
  - Celina commented that she would like to see growth with community stakeholders.
  - Chief Strange commented that even though he feels like he brings an outsider perspective due to him being new in the role of a CAPC member
he would like to see more folks in community see themselves as stakeholders.

- It was mentioned that one member “strongly disagreed” for items #12-16. Karleen stated that it would be helpful to identify solutions.
- Nine members “strongly agreed” that they felt their voice is valued in CAPC meetings - highest scored item in this section.
- Karleen noted that there was an additional comment that they would like for us to be more proactive and that she would welcome a discussion on how the group can accelerate short term efforts to impact child abuse prevention.

- Chief Strange mentioned that he thinks there has been great material produced by the CAPC over the years. He also thinks that a lot of people do not recognize resources that exist when there are tragedies of child abuse. He stated that there is a need to challenge ourselves to be more ready and get materials to people’s hands on how they can help reduce child abuse.
- Karleen acknowledged that these were all great points and thinks that the recommendations to the Yolo County Board of Supervisors were well received. She also mentioned there has been great work at the subcommittee level with notable accomplishments this year.
- Karleen suggested that there is also an opportunity to strengthen the connection between the CAPC and Child Death Review Team - how can the discussions at CDRT come back to the CAPC and inform child abuse prevention efforts? She would love to see this as a priority and welcomes any input.
- Victoria agreed that the CAPC has been successful and wonder if there is an opportunity to reach more community members. She mentioned the Strong Families Yolo website and said it was beautiful but wonders in how many hands it is in - this can be a low-cost opportunity to share.
- Karleen added that she shared the child abuse document with the Davis School District - great opportunity to connect with other school districts.
- Tracy thinks that when the CAPC can work proactively when tragedy strikes, they can help families and engage in policy work. Also, to note the lessons that CAPC has learned regarding getting resources to the community and making sure that underserved communities are being reached when tragedy strikes.
- Karleen welcomed any other feedback.
- For items #17-20, Karleen mentioned that Yolo County Children’s Alliance (YCCA) is the agency that is in charge of coordinating the CAPC.
- Overall, comments were positive.
- Karleen welcomed members to reach out to her if they wanted to for this section.
- Karleen took a moment to acknowledge Vanessa for stepping into the CAPC Program Manager role.
- For item #21, members felt the CAPC meeting frequency are “just right”
- For item #22, Karleen valued the focus on upstream efforts for the CAPC—real changes are very inspiring.
  - Karleen mentioned that she feels the CAPC has grown in those areas and that it feels great to be in her role working with a diverse group of people towards the same goal. She is very proud of the CAPC.
- Item #23, “How can the CAPC be improved...” Karleen reviewed and mentioned that this is a great opportunity for more short-term efforts and that she is very proud to hear that communication within the CAPC is good. She emphasized that equity and racial work is a priority on the action plan.
- For item #24, Karleen stated that the comments were very rich.
- For item #25, “CAP month theme...” and #26 “additional feedback” Karleen reviewed comments.

- Discuss 2021-2022 top priorities (Karleen Jakowski)
  - More community engagement
  - Making work more meaningful
  - Accelerate work (short-term efforts)
  - Chief Strange suggested to use comments regarding engagement for the outreach and engagement subcommittee.
  - Karleen asked any other feedback and/or comments—none.

  c. Discuss presentation of annual report to Yolo County Board of Supervisors and consider action to timing of presentation—moving it to the end of calendar year (Karleen Jakowski) (15 minutes)

  - The recommendations provided by the CAPC may influence funding priorities for Yolo County Board of Supervisors (BOS) and county.
  - The BOS presentation has historically been targeted for April but unfortunately it is a bit late since draft budgets for county departments are submitted in January.
  - Karleen noted that for discussion today was the timing of the BOS presentation and she wanted to note that she strongly recommended that if this change were to be implemented, that it begin for next year (If members chose to vote on change of timing) because of the time it takes to prepare the presentation and the short amount of time between the 2021 presentation and December 2021.
Considered that a benefit for providing the annual report in April is that it is another opportunity to highlight Child Abuse Prevention month.

Considered that a benefit for moving it is that the annual report would have more potential to inform how county funding is being prioritized.

Karleen opened up the floor for discussion.

- Celina commented that she was in favor of pushing it up a few months and getting more opportunities to talk to the Board of Supervisors.
- Karleen mentioned that the Board of Supervisors agenda gets light in December. And asked if CAPC members were thinking December or January?
  - Celina mentioned that earlier if possible and Victoria agreed given County department budget timelines and thinks it would be good for December.
  - Karleen reminded CAPC members that during the annual report presentation, the CAPC reports on CAP month activities and that make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors based on the work of the subcommittees. To try and report in January 2022 might be too soon—there would not be much to report by then.
  - Tracy suggested looking at mid-range goals and maybe consider February 2022 and the following year December (2022)—moving it up gradually to eventually fall in December each year.
  - Karleen commented that CAPC will always be in front of the BOS in April due to accepting child abuse prevention month resolutions and wanted to ensure there is substance when the annual report presentation is done.
  - Karleen summarized that Tracy suggested for this coming year to bump it up to February (2022) and next year to December 2022 and share that the CAPC will be changing timing of the BOS presentation and that CAPC will still be in front of the board when accepting child abuse prevention resolution.

**VOTE:** Rachelle Gayton motioned to approve changing timing of Yolo County Board of Supervisor’s presentation for next year to February 2022 and the next year to December 2022. Victoria Zimmerle seconded. All approved via roll call.

d. Discuss possibility of starting an ongoing Communications and Engagement Subcommittee (Karleen Jakowski) (15 minutes)

- Karleen asked if CAPC members wanted one or two subcommittees to be developed.
  - She mentioned that communication and engagement are two things that seem to be inter-connected.
  - Rachelle agreed as both reach out to the community and Chief Strange echoed that it can be one effort.
Yolo County Child Abuse Prevention Council

- Karleen mentioned that if the CAPC wants to do more targeted work that would imply meeting more and that would require more time. She thinks sub-committees are very successful.
- Tracy agreed that there is room for a subcommittee to help support engagement outside of meetings.

**VOTE:** Chief Strange motioned to create one sub-committee for communication and engagement. Tracy Fauver seconded. All approved via roll call.
- Karleen opened up the floor for any volunteers for the subcommittee. Volunteers are: Tracy, Rachelle, Chief Strange, and Celina.
- Karleen clarified that non-CAPC members can join the subcommittee and she remarked that she is very excited for the path that CAPC is taking.

5. **Informational Items (10 minutes)**
   a. Child abuse and neglect reporting data (Karleen Jakowski) (10 minutes)
      - Karleen did not have the data but will email. She noted that there has been a downward trajectory about a 20% decrease in foster population over the last year and that Child Welfare has at times seen a decline in child abuse reporting.
      - Karleen also mentioned that they will be implementing a Differential Response as a key strategy in the new System Improvement Plan.
      - Karleen welcomed anyone with questions regarding child welfare data to reach out to her.
      - Karleen turned to Jeneba for a brief YCCA update.
• Jeneba informed the CAPC that Vanessa (Child Abuse Prevention Program Manager) has submitted her resignation. Jeneba thanked Vanessa for her contribution to the CAPC and let them know that she will be the point of contact until they hire a new CAPC Program Manager.
- Vanessa addressed the CAPC members and thanked them for their contributions to the CAPC and Yolo County.
- CAPC members thanked Vanessa for the time spent with them.

6. Meeting review (Karleen Jakowski, 10 minutes)
   a. Discuss 3 talking points from meeting
      • Sad Vanessa is leaving
      • Jeneba will be the new point of contact.
      • Happy for the start of the new Communications and Engagement subcommittee.
      • Work of the CAPC is going well.
      • Bringing on Tessa Smith to the CAPC as a new member.
      • Shifting of the timeline for the Yolo County Board of Supervisor’s presentation.
   b. Request for future meeting topics
      • Karleen asked requests for future topics
      • None noted

7. Adjourn

Next CAPC meeting: 9am-11am on Friday, October 1, 2021, via Zoom or in person depending on action taken in CAPC meeting.

All meeting materials are available at https://www.yolokids.org/child-abuse-prevention-council
Yolo County Child Welfare Services (CWS) provides a variety of care services for youth in need. Open cases in CWS mean that a youth can be receiving services in one or more of the following programs: emergency response, family maintenance, and foster care (also known as out of home placement).

Data is provided below showing the total number of youth with an open case in CWS in Yolo County at a specific point in time and the program in which they are served. Additional data, including statewide information, is available from the UC Berkeley, California Child Welfare Indicators Project (https://ccwip.berkeley.edu/). Due to the daily fluctuation in cases and slight alterations in methodologies, it is important to note that small variations in the data may exist between sources.

### Yolo County CWS Total Youth/Children: By Program Type

#### (September 7, 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th># of Youth (Prior Month Change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Response:</strong> first service component upon case opening, child may be with their parent or guardian or in out of home placement.</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Maintenance:</strong> with a parent or guardian receiving services</td>
<td>133 (-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foster Care:</strong> out of home placement</td>
<td>350 (-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Reunification:</strong> out of home placement with plan to return to parent</td>
<td>183 (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permanency Planning:</strong> includes dependent guardianships, pending adoptions, and other out of home placements with no plan to return to parent</td>
<td>167 (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive Transition:</strong> Youth between 18-21 who voluntarily choose to continue to get support services from the agency.</td>
<td>82 (+4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th># of Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases in CWS Case Management System</td>
<td>566 (-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases pending closure</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cases</strong></td>
<td><strong>526 (-2)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Yolo County CWS Case Management System.

* Note: Data includes all open cases for ages 0-17, youth 18-21 who elect to remain in foster care, as well as youth 21+ who are eligible and opted in for the AB12 extension due to COVID-19. Therefore, a total of 526 youth fall under the jurisdiction of CWS.
# Yolo County CWS Foster Care: Placement Location

(September 7, 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th># of Youth (Prior Month Change)</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>Rel</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Guard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County</td>
<td>141 (+2)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of County</td>
<td>252 (-10)</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>99 (-8)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby Counties</td>
<td>44 (+1)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Counties</td>
<td>98 (-4)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other States</td>
<td>11 (+1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Yolo County CWS Case Management System.

FC (foster care), Rel (Relative or Dependent Guardianship), Self (18+ Supervised Independent Living)

Note: Data may not include all removals in past thirty days due to data entry lag.
Yolo County Child Welfare Services (CWS) provides a variety of care services for youth in need. Open cases in CWS mean that a youth can be receiving services in one or more of the following programs: emergency response, family maintenance, and foster care (also known as out of home placement).

Data is provided below showing the total number of youth with an open case in CWS in Yolo County at a specific point in time and the program in which they are served. Additional data, including statewide information, is available from the UC Berkeley, California Child Welfare Indicators Project (https://ccwip.berkeley.edu/). Due to the daily fluctuation in cases and slight alterations in methodologies, it is important to note that small variations in the data may exist between sources.

### Yolo County CWS Total Youth/Children: By Program Type (August 6, 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th># of Youth (Prior Month Change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Response:</strong> first service component upon case opening, child may be with their parent or guardian or in out of home placement.</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Maintenance:</strong> with a parent or guardian receiving services</td>
<td>144 (-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foster Care:</strong> out of home placement</td>
<td>352 (-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Reunification:</strong> out of home placement with plan to return to parent</td>
<td>184 (-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permanency Planning:</strong> includes dependent guardianships, pending adoptions, and other out of home placements with no plan to return to parent</td>
<td>168 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive Transition:</strong> Youth between 18-21 who voluntarily choose to continue to get support services from the agency.</td>
<td>78 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cases in CWS Case Management System | 575 (-22) |
Cases pending closure                      | 47        |
Total Cases                                | 528 (-12) |

*Note: Data includes all open cases for ages 0-17, youth 18-21 who elect to remain in foster care, as well as youth 21+ who are eligible and opted in for the AB12 extension due to COVID-19. Therefore, a total of 528 youth fall under the jurisdiction of CWS.*
# Yolo County CWS Foster Care: Placement Location
(August 6, 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th># of Youth (Prior Month Change)</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>Rel</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Guard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County</td>
<td>139 (0)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of County</td>
<td>262 (-3)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>107 (-3)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby Counties (Sutter, Yuba, Butte, Solano, Colusa)</td>
<td>43 (-6)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Counties</td>
<td>102 (+5)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other States</td>
<td>10 (+1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Yolo County CWS Case Management System.

FC (foster care), Rel (Relative or Dependent Guardianship), Self (18+ Supervised Independent Living)

Note: Data may not include all removals in past thirty days due to data entry lag.