



**Statewide Children's Wraparound Initiative:
Education Work Group Report
April 15, 2009**

This work group met a total of eight times, two of which were meetings held at Willamette Education Services District in Salem. The remaining meetings were held via conference call. There was care taken initially to be inclusive of education from early education, K-12 education, and higher education as well as covering both rural and urban districts. Education professionals, as well as parents and youth, participated in the work group. Additionally, as noted in the list of members, it was intentional to include representation from the Oregon Education Association (OEA) and from the Confederation of School Administrators (COSA) and other interested education advocates. The Charge for the group was developed collaboratively between the Governor's Office and the Department of Education in order to continue the support and outreach for the Statewide Children's Wraparound Initiative with the education community.

Charge:

1. Identify and problem-solve Wraparound Initiative implementation issues unique to education
2. Develop and implement a communications strategy about the Wraparound Initiative targeted to folks at different levels within the education community

Members by Category:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Name</u>
Teacher-Regular Ed/Sp-Lang:	Merri Steele, Eugene SD/OEA
Administrator-Special Programs	Sandy Bishop, Redmond SD
Principal:	Bryan Starr, Scio HS/COSA
Special Ed Director:	*Larry Sullivan, Eugene SD/CO-CHAIR Mary Apple, UMESD
Family: PTA	Anita Green, PTA



Members by Category (cont.):

<u>Category</u>	<u>Name</u>
OFSN	*Shelly Joyce-Chair, SACSE/CO-CHAIR Debra Depew Kris Anderson
Early Childhood: Child Care	Jean Johnson/Eastern OR CCR&R Dawn Norris/CC Div
Head Start	Dawn Barberis/MHCC-HS
EI/ESC	Jody Mumford
ESD:	Naomi Bledsoe/MESD Kathryn Henderson/LBLESD
Youth: OFSN	Julie Brand DJ Depew
Education Communication Specialists:	Naomi Bledsoe (see ESD above)
Higher Education: PSU	Chris Borgmeier, PhD
UofO	Brigid Flannery/Uof O
Superintendent:	Paula Radich-Newberg SD/COSA
Education Advocate	Dave Masunaga/MESD



Identify and Problem-solve Wraparound Initiative Implementation Issues Unique to Education:

Over the course of the year, the Education Work Group identified the following issues:

- **Language Barriers**—in general there is jargon attached to discussions about “system of care,” “wraparound” and “benefit packages” that is unfamiliar to education.
- **Target Population**—education is wary of any population defined in law that may saddle education resources with the costs of providing for an “at risk” population without adequate resources following that requirement.
- **Age Range**—the age range served by education is birth to 21 years of age, inclusive of early childhood, K-12 and special education settings. This is not the same range as the population defined by the Statewide Initiative.
- **Individual Education Plan and Plan of Care**—education is concerned about “related services” such as therapy or mental health counseling that may incur excessive costs for education.
- **Funding**—education will resist any effort to change the Basic State School Funding Formula, a long-standing methodology for funding K-12 services. Discussions about “blended funding” would go farther if the terms “pooled” or “leveraged” funding were used.
- **Communication**—education isn’t one entity. There are 196 separate school districts in the state with separate Boards of Directors; early childhood education consists of multiple Head Start programs (some federally funded, some state funded and some locally funded) plus special education provided by Education Services Districts and Pre-Kindergarten classes provided by some but not all school districts. Higher education is represented by Community Colleges and the University system. With such complex jurisdictions and funding systems, communication to the “Education System” must be multi-pronged and consistent in outreach.
- **Too Many Meetings**—requirements for student achievement make it very difficult for teachers to be present at multiple meetings required by systemic planning and individual plans of care.
- **Confidentiality Barriers**—concerns about requirements from HIPAA and FERPA making it very difficult to share information.

These issues were discussed in several meetings. The following are the recommendations for problem-solving these issues. It should be remembered that the most important lesson learned is that very few educators are familiar with the



Wraparound Initiative, even after several years of local system of care projects. There is still much work to be done to engage this system.

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>SUGGESTED SOLUTION</u>
Language	Have educators represented (EC through K-12) at every planning process; try to use inclusive, non-jargon language as much as possible.
Target Population	Clarify the use of the term “at risk” in any funding formula
Age Range	Consider the inclusion of special education youth to the age of 21, as is required by education law.
IEPs and Plans of Care	Some regions, such as Multnomah County and Mid-Columbia, have solved this problem locally. They have taken care that the IEP is an education tool used to inform the Plan of Care. The educator is responsible for writing the IEP with the family but this can be done in the same time frame as the Care Coordinator completes the POC with an outcome of better communication and fewer meetings across systems.
Funding	The State Basic Funding Formula should be left as is, with decisions about local contributions to a wrap-around entity negotiated locally. The state-funded systems such as the Oregon Health Plan, Mental Health and Addiction Services and Child Welfare can be pooled at the state level and directed to local entities that are ready with locally negotiated contributions from education, juvenile justice and philanthropy.
Communications	This is very key. This Work Group barely scratched the surface of the need to inform educators and advocates across the state. Multiple methods should be used with individuals on the implementation team being held accountable to provide information on a



regular basis across the state through electronic communication to school districts, early childhood groups. A focus on the benefits of wraparound for educators is highly recommended.

Too Many Meetings

After discussion, it became more clear that actually fewer meetings are required when combined with requirements such as IEPs, etc. The Care Coordinator can assist the educator with communications required. This is actually one of the benefits of a robust wraparound system.

Confidentiality

This is an issue that has been solved locally by several jurisdictions. Because it can be somewhat idiosyncratic to local school district policies, it is suggested that the state assist by creating a single policy for DHS programs, if possible, and that local school districts and families can agree on appropriate information sharing in order to be involved in a wraparound program.

While these are some of the problems that were identified in the course of the Work Group's meetings, it is clear that others will surface as the work goes forward. Therefore, it is recommended that this topic, given the 196+ different jurisdictions and the myriad of early childhood programs involved, specifically for education, continue to be on the agenda of the implementation team until Wraparound is in place throughout the state. Any such group should have shared leadership from the Department of Education, the Department of Human Services and have representatives from local education and advocates. It has served this group well to have representatives from a wide spectrum of the education arena.

Develop and Implement a Communications Strategy about the Wraparound Initiative Targeted to Folks at Different Levels within the Education Community

The Work Group developed a three-pronged plan for communications. It is strongly recommended that this plan be continued as the Wraparound Initiative is implemented. The lead agency and the partner agencies (DHS, ODE, OYA, Commission on Children



and Families) should continue to implement this plan as the work goes forward. Again, the education community is barely informed about wraparound and its potential.

Step One: Education Flyer/Electronic Distribution

A sub-committee on Communication developed an Education Flyer that can be circulated among educators and advocates. This flyer was distributed on the Statewide Children's Wraparound Initiative listserv. Copies have been made and are available for distribution to various educators and education advocates. It is on the website as well.

Step Two: Group Education and Outreach

The Work Group made a list of education groups for outreach. The outreach included sending out the Education Flyer to organizations such as: State PTA, OEA, COSA, OSBA, OAESD, Stand For Children, Children First, The Chalkboard Project and the Children's Institute asking that they distribute the flyer in their newsletters.

Also, the group has solicited a presence at any conference or gatherings to offer information about wraparound and its benefits in the education setting. The suggested format for such a presentation includes:

- Distribution of the Education Flyer
- Panel including a parent advocate, preferably from OFSN, and an educator advocate such as the Student Services or Special Education Director.
- Discussion about successful wraparound situations and outcomes focusing on increased achievement and attendance.

The Work Group co-chairs are available for consultation and will be participating at the Spring COSA conference. Unfortunately this year many groups cancelled their normal Spring conferences because of economic set-backs. Follow-up will be needed with the education advocate groups contacted as wraparound is more fully developed.

Step Three: Positive Behavior Supports-Readiness Criteria

This approach to integrating evidence-based education practice and evidence-based mental health practice has been growing in Oregon. It is a prevention, early intervention method to assist in helping students achieve and is present in early childhood as well as K-12 settings. While Wraparound would be engaged with the 5-15% of the student population who have more intensive service needs, it is far more successful in a school building using PBS. About 34% of Oregon schools now use PBS and it is hoped that number will double quickly. It is recommended that efforts to integrate PBS and Wraparound in school settings be encouraged as this will allow for service integration for social service and education, a place to develop common language, and tie the process to the culture of the building and the community.



It is strongly recommended that the one of the wraparound readiness criteria applied to local regions be involvement with a model such as Positive Behavior Supports and/or have a strong record of communication and coordination between social services and school services such as 504, Special Education, Alternative Education and counseling/mental health services.

Next Steps

It is expected that the implementation of the Statewide Children's Wraparound Initiative will be authorized by the legislature this year. This committee should continue to be included in the process as the local sites are initiated. The world of education is very complex and multi-faceted with responsibilities for first hand education of our youth from birth through 21 as well as workforce development efforts. This group can help to smooth that process, avoiding missteps often caused unintentionally by inadequate communication among child-serving agencies.