

**Office for Children and Families
Executive Leadership Committee
Meeting Notes – February 18, 2004**

Members	Present	Members	Present
Barbara Riley	X	Jim Smith	X
Rick Smith	X	Chip Spinning	-
Michael Ring	-	Crystal Allen	X
Terry Miller	X	Donald Wake	-
Loretta Adams	Judy Chavis	Dean Sparks	X
Suzanne Alexander	X	Bruce Anderson	X
Kim Newsome	-	Jim Beard	-
John Saros	X	Jim McCafferty	-
Rhonda Reagh	X	Suzanne Burke	X
Kevin Holt	X	Tom Schied	-
Michael Trivisonno	X	Julie Mogavero	-

<u>OCF Staff:</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>OCF Staff</u>	<u>Present</u>
Terrie Hare	-	Sally Pedon	-
Joan Van Hull	X	Dennis Blazey	X
Nancy DeRoberts	-	Fran Rembert	X
Evelyn Bissonnette	X	Jessie Tower	X
Candace Valach	X	Kristin Gilbert	-
Linda Ciciretto	X		

Welcome/announcements:

1. Barbara Riley was promoted to Assistant Director of ODJFS overseeing four program areas: Family Stability; Children and Families; Ohio Health Plans; and Child Support.
2. Rick Smith was named Acting Deputy Director of Children and Families and Michael Ring will stay as Assistant Deputy Director. Barbara Riley hopes to name a Deputy Director by May.
3. Fran Rembert was named Acting Chief of the Bureau of Family Services. Michael Ring is currently in the process of seeking a new Chief.
4. The budget situation is not promising for state fiscal years 2005, 2006 and 2007. We are beginning to analyze the situations in order to understand possible consequences.
5. The SACWIS kick-off event is scheduled for Thursday, February 26th. The contract is currently in DAS for signatures.

Budget:

Current FFY 2003:

The current federal allocation is good news for PCSAs. There has been a decrease in CAPTA with no impact to PCSAs. Title IV-B II has a \$400,000 increase which will increase the PCSA emergency service allocations, and Title IV-B I was reduced by \$100,000 without reducing the PCSA allocation.

President's Proposal:

For FFY 2004 child care is currently flat funded with a reduction of ½ % cut across board Ohio will lose little money. With the reauthorization of TANF and child care pending, child care can assume a \$1 billion increase over 5 years. This will be an additional \$200 million of which Ohio will see \$7 million.

For child welfare we have seen a \$100 million growth in IV-E foster care and the sizeable increase in IV-E adoption assistance. The President's proposal has added an initiative to recruit foster parents and the IV-E flexible funding option. Ohio is still researching but we have not seen anything new. It continues to be of interest.

ProtectOHIO – we are still awaiting a response regarding our renewal. We filed a proposal to expand. We are operating under a current extension authority that will expire in March. We are trying to establish a phone conversation with HHS and we will likely see another bridge extension until the end of the FFY.

PA 01-02 – it seems that HHS, over the next FFY, will adopt a formal regulation fully implementing 01-02. 01-02 proposes to preclude claiming administrative costs for case management activities for otherwise eligible kids in non-licensed, relative homes. President's proposal does have the savings of this implementation/enforcement built into the budget proposal. 18% of all children are placed with unlicensed relatives and this continues to grow. Over 82% of these children are IV-E eligible. This results in a loss to Ohio of \$24 million per year. We are very concerned about this and we have continued involvement with APHSA to change this in terms of a legislative remedy.

Crystal Allen, PCSAO, raised the point that the Pew Commission – responsible for making recommendations to Congress on child welfare financing reform – is likely to release their recommendations by mid-May. The Commission has asked Congress not to act on anything until their recommendations are released.

State Fiscal Years 2005-2007:

OBM released instruction for 2006/2007, accelerating the horizon by three months. We will be finalizing by June for submission to OBM in July.

There is no growth in GRF for 2006/2007 from ending 2005 levels. Ending 2005 levels could have cuts depending on sales tax or if revenue projections decrease. The model OCF will be using regarding the SCPA is 1. flatline; 2. <5%; 3 <10% into 2006/2007. This is not a pretty picture as there are very few mitigating strategies. AA is exempt.

Question:

Will ODJFS be prioritizing budget items through ELCs?

Answer:

Don't know how the department will structure feedback.

Placement Level of Care Tool

The Placement Level of Care Tool is a consistent method of deciding how to decide placement; how to determine appropriate placement, etc. Cuyahoga County is currently using a great tool to assess kids, including a very intense family meeting to determine family placement, community services, etc. They don't use the tool until the child requires out-of-home paid placement...not extended family.

The tool collects very little historical data, primarily on deciding treatment services/needs and points to placement (traditional foster care, etc.).

This tool can be obtained from PCSAO. ODJFS is currently working with Cuyahoga County to convert the tool into an easy-to-use database. ODJFS is researching the utilization of a study regarding the tool and its inter-rater reliability. ODMH will do parallel study regarding their treatment – does their Ohio Scales Assessment point to similar treatment needs. ODADAS has Protocols for Youth Levels of Care – does our tool point child in same location as their tool? ODJFS has not endorsed this without the validation study.

Several directors raised the following concerns:

1. Will ODJFS be promulgating rules on this? Each county has different philosophy regarding placement and they do not want to leave these placement choices up to a tool.
2. What cost benefit is expected from cross system needs?
3. Cuyahoga County has not experienced changes in placement by using this tool. There are system issues regarding cost containment, definitions, etc.
4. County agencies are seeing a huge increase in placement costs – most counties are going to levies. Franklin County has seen a decrease in the number of kids; however they have seen an increase in costs and an increase in the number of 13-17 year olds. This doubled with increase in kids is a dual problem. The only solution is to mandate all courts to claim for IV-E reimbursements.
5. Can the PIP kid tracking form be expanded to include collection of juvenile delinquent kid data?
6. What is the role of custody relinquishment bill – what is need of child and strategy to document cases that come before the court?
7. Role of dependency statute?

Screening Workgroup

1. The Supreme Court Subcommittee will be represented by Rhonda Reagh and Bob Kubiak – ELC members. The Supreme Court meeting is March 30. The group has been configured including law enforcement, attorneys, prosecutors, Mental Health. It still needs representation from the Ohio Association of Chief of Police. The RFP has been completed and the vendor is expected to be on board at the March meeting.
2. The group reviewed CPOE Stage V data regarding screening.
3. Screening practices are all over the place.
4. The group reviewed the PCSAO standards.
5. The group will review the COA standards.
6. The prior screening rule was never implemented and the Workgroup created a subcommittee to review this screening tool to see if it is valid now.
7. Next full meeting is in May.

OCWTP Workgroup:

The OCWTP Workgroup continues to meet to develop the RFP and to research statutory changes. Specifically, the group is reviewing the following statutory changes:

1. releasing RFP every two years, allowing for 2+2 renewal;
2. specific OCWTP information regarding curriculum to be broader; and,
3. RTC specific language – designation of host counties.

Other issues being considered by the OCWTP Workgroup include the addition of deliverable language into the grant agreements with RTCs and the incorporation of evaluations. Other performance based issues will be discussed.

Advocates Meeting:

The ELC advocates met on February 5th to determine their continue involvement with the ELC and OCF Office functions. It was decided that the advocates would like OCF to host an annual meeting to discuss the year's budget initiatives, themes, program goals, etc. This first meeting will be hosted in March 2003 and will be open to all who wish to attend. The advocates also wanted more involvement with OCF through a "listserv" concept and the internet/website.

PASSS

The PASSS rules committee met in June 2002 to focus the rules on the original intent of the program. Rule changes were made as well as form changes; specifically 1050 JFS, 1050 A and 1051.

The new rule requires a 5% co-payment on PASSS services. The eligible amount was lowered from \$15,000 to \$10,000. Families can request additional dollars but only in extreme circumstances. The rules will be ready for clearance by the end of the week, February 20th.

The ELC recommended that ODJFS train the state hearing officers on the final rule.

Adoption Assistance

The special needs rule was revised, including the re-entry of the at-risk category with additional criteria. The AA with no payment is when a child has been identified as at-risk; however they do not receive money payment but Medicaid coverage. These rules will be in clearance before February 20th.

The ELC recommended that ODJFS train the state hearing officers on the final rule.

Data

HHS released their data profile for the CFSR outcomes for 2000, 2001 and 2002 (calendar year). The ELC was asked to review/ analyze the data.

Next Agenda:

SIS – county backlog

ICPC – backlog

Administrative agreements between states

APS update

Child Care/Head Start Plus update and Child care rule changes