

**Office for Children and Families  
Executive Leadership Committee  
Meeting Notes – September 18, 2003**

<b>Members</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Members</b>	<b>Present</b>
China Widener	X	Julie Mogavero	-
Barbara Riley	X	Jim Smith	X
Rick Smith	X	Chip Spinning	-
Michael Ring	X	Crystal Allen	X
Buzz Long	-	Terry Miller	-
Loretta Adams	-	Dean Sparks	X
Suzanne Alexander	-	Mike Trivisonno	-
Kim Newsome	-	Jim Beard	-
John Saros	-	Jim McCafferty	Mary Mitchell
Rhonda Reagh	X	Suzanne Burke	-
Kevin Holt	-	Tom Schied	-
Bruce Anderson	X		
Erin Joyce, CDF	X		
<b>OCF Staff:</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>OCF Staff</b>	<b>Present</b>
Terrie Hare	X	Sally Pedon	-
Joan Van Hull	X	Dennis Blazey	-
Nancy DeRoberts	-	Ronald Browder	X
Evelyn Bissonnette	X	Jessie Tower	X
Candace Novak	X	Rhonda Abban	X
Kristin Gilbert	-	Barbara Turpin	X
Linda Ciciretto	X	Barbara Harris-Starks	X
Carrie Anthony	X		

**Pending Policy and Clearance:** OCF developers posed the question regarding the licensing of managed care agencies and why they are not licensed, as other private agencies, for performing placement services. The Office of Legal Services agreed and OCF would like to gather county agency comments on potential consequences if we do pursue licensure of private managed care agencies. The ELC reflected that this primarily concerns Hamilton and Franklin Counties, and they were not in attendance. The ELC decided to table the conversation until the next meeting. Greene County CSB suggested to OCF that we should discuss this issue at the upcoming ProtectOHIO Consortium meeting as this probably impacts them more. Other comments included:

1. Role of accreditation as certification/licensure (JCAHO and COA)?
2. Are these managed care agencies currently certified?

**Mandating SACWIS/COA:** The SACWIS recommendation for vendor was submitted to HHS for approval and they have 60 days to respond. It is hoped that the SACWIS vendor will begin by the beginning of 2004; with a kick-off planned for November. In addition to SACWIS, HHS is finally reviewing the SACWIS historical reconciliation and given their review, we may owe HHS an estimated \$3 million. In terms of mandating SACWIS, Ohio must guarantee statewide-ness and mandating SACWIS ensures this. We could include language in the next biennium budget. By that time, we should have a SACWIS prototype in place and be in the testing phase. The ELC felt that there is clarity among all counties that they will join SACWIS and there is no need

to mandate the project. Champaign County DJFS indicated that timing is everything, and with the current issues surrounding SCOTI and SETS, it would not be a good time to mandate SACWIS.

COA: OCF filed its application with COA last week; 9 county agencies are already accredited; 8 are in the First Class; and 8 have registered for the Second Class. We are currently determining the role of best practice in relation to our rules and mandating COA relates to such. The ELC advised that we not mandate COA given the current financial difficulties in county agencies. They reported that all county agencies are “in trouble” with levies not being requested because there is no guarantee that they can pass or renewed. It is not recommended to move forward with COA mandates.

**Day Care Advisory Council and ELC:** OCF testified in front of the Sunset Review Committee on the transformation of the DCAC into a child care ELC. By law, the DCAC must have 6 providers, 3 family child care representatives, 3 parents, 2 county departments of job and family services, 4 community professionals for a total of 18 voting members. Statute also allows for 4 ex-officio members including representatives from the Departments of JFS, Commerce, Education and Health. It is the Office’s proposal to increase the number of county agency representatives from 2 to 6; thereby increasing the number of voting members to 22. A few DCAC members will probably oppose our recommendation. Other comments included:

1. The DCAC was initially formed to deal with licensing and to allow for the regulated community to have input into the regulatory process. In 1990, with the creation of subsidized child care, the scope of the DCAC expanded.
2. The subsidized child care program is huge; 105,000 children/month at an appropriation of \$552 million.
3. Private providers are driving an increase in cost for the entire child care community. If they have larger voice (via the DCAC), we will potentially see less community providers because of competition and the voice of the proprietary. For small communities there are fewer providers, less parental choice and high costs. This is geographically driven issue.
4. Several DCAC members have been working outside the scope of the Council by approaching the General Assembly. What are other options to making this a good group?
5. For the inclusion of parents (consistent participation) OCF should tap community child care associations. There may also be a linkage through the Family and Children First Councils. In addition, meeting logistics may have to change in order to accommodate parents’ schedules, including using focus groups, Resource and Referrals, and video conferencing.
6. Parents have to have a reason for attending.

*Legislation:*

Representative Redfern is planning on introducing legislation that would require the certification of all home child care providers. This would eventually do away with PPIs, increase administrative costs to county agencies, and increase oversight/monitoring of regulations.

Senator Steivers is working on legislation regarding the sharing of information between county agencies. This legislation will also include requirements about all providers required to do BCII checks. This would alleviate some issues identified by Representative Redfern.

**FCFC:** The Cabinet Council met on Wednesday to look at new initiatives for 2004-2005, including mental health for children in the child protective system. This initiative is built on the CFSR and coincides with PCSAO's efforts at the same. PCSAO convened a meeting with Directors and senior staff from the Departments of JFS, YS, MH, ODADAS, Family and Children First and the Ohio Association of County Behavioral Health Authorities. The focus of this meeting was asking for agreement that this initiative should be the major initiative in the 2006-2007 biennial budget. PCSAO Trustees recently passed a motion in support of the initiative, and they are currently conducting a survey to all county directors seeking specific MH/funding/children in care answers. The discussion turned towards gathering data to make a more informed policy decision.

**Adoption Assistance:** A public hearing on the proposed Adoption Assistant rules was held on September 8 and the county agencies provided proponent testimony; however, many private agencies provided opponent testimony. In response to the private agencies, several were invited to attend the ELC to discuss their concerns with the proposed rules. Their five main areas of concerns include:

1. The "at-risk" language should be included.
2. The documentation of efforts to place children without subsidy and registering them with OAPL needs to be loosened.
3. Sibling Groups should not be restricted to "three or more" as this proposed a barrier for placements.
4. Age should not be part of the "at-risk" definition.
5. Nonrecurring adoption expense should be increased from \$1,000 to \$2,000.

There was also conversation around the inconsistencies among counties on how they administer adoption assistance.

After the presentation by the private agencies, discussion centered on the consequences of taking their recommendations. Counties in attendance felt that we need to continue to hold the line on the definition of special needs, but that if we could allow for the issuance of a Medicaid card without incurring large unknown future liability for the counties, they would be in agreement. Several approaches were considered, and Barbara Riley expressed a concern regarding future state liability as well. A suggestion was made that moving the administration of adoption assistance for private agencies to the state would address the inconsistencies among counties, and would allow the state some control over future costs. OCF will need to develop concrete policies within a few weeks in order to move these rules forward within the JCARR process.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:30 p.m.