

**Office for Children and Families
Executive Leadership Committee
Meeting Notes – November 20, 2003**

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

Crystal welcomed everyone and asked for introductions. She then recognized Ron Browder for the national adoption award he had recently received.

Nancy DeRoberts provided a SACWIS update. Some highlights:

- ✍ Sept 12 review sent to HHS. Conditional approval w/questions has been received.
- ✍ In process of formalizing a response to ACF
- ✍ IAPD is also being completed to secure funding
- ✍ When blanket approval is received we will go to DAS to work out issues and initiate PO
- ✍ Looking at kick off date Jan 19, 2004 and a 54 month contract include 1 year post implementation services
- ✍ 18 month – pilot in place
- ✍ 2006 – Statewide implementation based on Jan start
- ✍ BAS/IT staff in training now
- ✍ Space being developed
- ✍ Kick off in January w/ PCSA's and vendor on Monday – last 4 SIS counties implemented

Barbara provided a Head Start Plus update. The implementation council includes ODE, ODJFS, Legislators, and providers. There was time for each interest area to make presentations based on data. Providers are unsure if all the necessary services can be provided at a cost of \$8,600 per child.

- ✍ The ELC Survey results were distributed and discussed. Questions were raised about whether use of video conferences or changing the frequency of meeting might affect participation. It was suggested that meetings be scheduled for every other month with the off months being used for subcommittee meetings

✍

The licensing of managed care entities were discussed. A paper by Terry Freeman was distributed to define the issue. The basic question is: should managed care agencies that place children and either do or arrange for casework services to be provided be licensed by the state. Questions arose about if the managed care agencies are assuming some of the role of PCPAs.

Hamilton County provided information on the Magellan managed care agency and said that they are not a care giver. They hold all contracts, authorize services, set rate structures, determine care level, etc. That all placement cases go thru Magellan. Magellan is not licensed.

Franklin County has had two providers OYAP and PFSN. They use a random selection to assign cases between the managed care agencies and FCCS except that FCCS handles hearing impaired and medical fragile, intake and investigations, and FCCS holds custody.

The issue was identified as two-fold – licensing and managed care. And it was questioned as to if the issue is different in waiver counties.

It was recommended that Licensing staff need to determine if managed care agencies are doing things covered by rule and if they are, they need to be licensed? Also, ODJFS might want to like as how ODJFS licenses managed care agencies in Medicaid.

For future agenda:

- ✍ Cost containment
- ✍ multi-system kids
- ✍ state role in controlling costs

Crystal – provided information on the MR/DD conference. She suggested that at a future agenda meeting, the ELC might was to discuss the different responsibilities of the two agencies in for providing services to MRDD children.

The Screening Group distributed minutes of their meeting and said they are coordinating with the Supreme Court workgroup.

The progress of the ELC subcommittee for the OCWTP RFP process was briefly discussed.

The Adoption Assistance rules were pulled and will be re-filed. The ELC was asked for guidance on the definition of “at risk”. The ELC was told that there are 116 cases in public agencies and 154 cases in private agencies that are classified as “at risk” and meet no other eligibility criteria for receiving adoption assistance. Three questions were asked, Crystal noted that PCSAO has strongly recommended “at-risk” be based on medical symptoms and history, sibling group size or age would not lead to an at-risk category. Those issues are already addressed within the Special Needs definition:

- 1) Do we remove the at risk category or make it possible to be at risk but receive no immediate assistance?
- 2) What size sibling group would qualify for at risk?
- 3) At what age would a child with no other at risk factors be considered at risk

There was a discussion about maintaining Medicaid eligibility for children. Children who qualify for SAMS still need to have a special assessment for Medicaid.

There was a consensus for maintaining a narrow definition of “at risk,” with criteria for Special Needs including a sibling group of three or more, and making the age 6 and over.

The PASSS program was briefly discussed.

Additional items for the next agenda were identified as:

- ✍ forum for providers to come together
- ✍ Summit County and strike
- ✍ Help Desk

The ELC meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.