

JOIN HANDS FOR CHILDREN
MINUTES FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL ISSUES
February 26, 2010

Members Present: Sharon Osborne; Carole Holland; Jeanine Livingston; Catherine Lanham (on phone)

Staff Present: Julie Dunnington, Melissa Takade and Benjamin Berres, Partners for Our Children

Others: Jann Hoppler, Kelci Karl-Robinson, Molly Elliot and Rich Pannkuk, DSHS Children's Administration; Marna Miller and Stephanie Lee, Washington State Institute of Public Policy; Laurie Lippold, Danny Howe, and Rommel Buenafe, Children's Home Society of Washington; Trudy Soucoup, Community Youth Services; Sandi Triggs, Office of Financial Management

Co-chairs Sharon Osborne and Carole Holland conducted the welcome and introductions.

First Agenda Item: Overview of the findings and implementation of Washington State Children's Administration Workload Study

Jann Hoppler of Children's Administration (CA) gave an overview of the findings from the Washington State Children's Administration Workload Study. The study was conducted from 2007-2009 and meticulously examined all of the work completed by social workers and the time required to complete each activity. Only the first 20 pages were handed out during the meeting. One of the reasons CA completed this study was to better understand what social workers do and to explore whether their activities could be restructured to be more time-efficient and effective. Jeanine Livingston, committee member, was involved in the entire process of the study. She added that the study was created out of a recommendation from an independent evaluator who claimed that CA required approximately 1500 FTE's to accomplish all of its work. In response to this report, CA was told to find ways to be more efficient; this study was designed to accomplish that directive. In the end, CA identified a number of areas on which to improve. Holland felt that this information would be useful for private agencies to better understand CA casework. Osborne added that this study illustrated the many aspects of the work completed by social workers that could potentially be performed by individuals with lesser credentials. Hoppler claimed that when CA divides up the work according to who is best-suited, the work that requires the least credentialed employees is often labeled as not critical and then is subject to budget cuts.

Second Agenda Item: Information regarding IT infrastructure and current resources for quality assurance and contract management

Hoppler and Kelci Karl-Robinson reviewed three reports examining CA cost data. The first report was titled *Children's Administration Regional Staff Month Report*, which showed the number of staff paid for by CA, by region, by month. Page 15 is a summary of the services paid for by CA. The numbers in each column are listed in staff-months. Holland asked whether CA knows which functions will remain in CA during the demonstration site evaluation. Hoppler replied that there is no answer to this question yet, but suggested that the Advisory Committee on Legal and Practice Issues might wish to address this question.

The committee talked next about IT infrastructure, particularly access to FamLink, and current resources for quality assurance and contract management. Hoppler stated that CA is in the

process of creating an approach to contract monitoring and quality assurance, but that it will likely be different from Phase I to Phase II. She also said that CA is envisioning a contract monitoring process that integrates practice, outcomes, and finance. At this point in time, though, CA is still unable to identify what resource levels will be required to adequately monitor supervising agency contracts. Holland asked about contractor access to FamLink. Hoppler said that CA's operating assumption is that the entity performing primary case management has to be able to do that work within Washington State's singular information system. CA envisions that supervising agencies will have direct access into FamLink. They do not think that it will be a platform download/upload. There are some issues, however, around figuring out how to ensure that some people have full FamLink access and others have only partial access. There are some tribes that currently have read-only access to FamLink.

Third Agenda Item: Progress update regarding information and instruction on how to draw down Title IV-E money from the federal government/any restrictions to Title IV-B/summary of revenue sources

Molly Elliot of CA led this discussion. She first explained two color 3-D pie charts that break down CA's revenue sources and from which statute they originate. Holland asked if the graph can be provided at some point in the future with attached dollar amounts. Elliot then talked about how and where IV-B1 and IV-B2 can be used. The feds stipulate that at least 20 percent of IV-B2 funds must go to Family Preservation Services, at least 20 percent goes toward Family Support Services, at least 20 percent goes toward Time-Limited Family Reunification Services, at least 20 percent goes toward Adoption Support Services, and no more than 10 percent be spent on administrative services. Supplantation, or maintenance of effort, funds for IV-B2 is \$24.3 million. This money always has to be there to draw down federal funds. Title IV-B2 funding levels are based on the average monthly number of children receiving food stamps in the last three years. Title IV-B1 money, approx. \$5.3 million, can be used more generally and is spent on a variety of services.

Hoppler presented the next two documents. The first is a table listing the total number of unduplicated providers and total funding based on FamLink services, by county, by service type. The money in each county indicates where the payment was made, not where the child was from. This table helps to identify regions that are resource-scarce. They also presented a table listing all providers receiving more than \$100,000 in CA contracts. Hoppler guessed that CA is approximately two months away from providing a more accurate and detailed table of service provider cost information. In the Contracted Providers by Amount Received in FY09 form, many of the top recipients are providers of Behavioral Rehabilitation Services (BRS) services. This is because BRS services are relatively expensive compared to many other types of services. Karl-Robinson, primary author of the two tables, said that she and her staff are working on identifying the number of children and families service providers.

Before the advisory committee's break, Hoppler mentioned that CA is considering conducting an informal Request-For-Information to assess the level of interest in holding a master contract among service providers. She said that she will present this question to all the committees.

BREAK

When the committee reconvened, Osborne, along with Danny Howe and Rommel Buenafe, gave a presentation on the core services offered by Children's Home Society of Washington (CHS) and the costs associated with each service. Osborne first outlined CHS's practice model while addressing each of the *Core Principles* that drive their practice. She also described the range and quantity of services provided through their network of statewide offices or their

community partners. She also gave a brief summary of where CHS revenues originate. Only 25 percent of agency revenue comes from Washington State and the rest comes from federal, private, and local funding sources. She also mentioned some of the ways in which CHS is reviewed and monitored.

Buenafe gave the next major portion of the presentation: a summary of how CHS funds some of their service offerings. For the first type of service, Facilities-Based BRS Residential Treatment, the annualized cost per child is \$110,000, but only 64 percent of the funding is paid for by the State and the remainder is paid by private funds. For basic foster care, CHS pays an annualized cost \$14,190 per child and the state pays 86% of this total cost. For treatment foster care, CHS pays an annualized cost of \$34,000 per child and 9% of the funding comes from the state. For child and family counseling, the annualized cost per child is \$2,728 and is 99% paid by the state.

Lastly, he talked briefly about CHS's centralized infrastructure functions and capabilities. Some of these functions include: financial management/contacts; information technology system; human resources and training; strategic planning; performance quality improvement; research and development; marketing and communications; public policy and advocacy; fund development; facilities and asset management; and records management.

Julie Dunnington briefly mentioned that the Advisory Committee on Legal and Practice Issues has crafted a preliminary list of core services and that this list will be presented, in some form, at the full TDC meeting in mid/late March. She also requested that all Finance Advisory Committee members submit ideas to her for future committee directions. The committee chairs agreed to hold a conference call the following week to formulate an agenda for the next meeting.

The next Finance Advisory Committee meeting will take place on March 26, 2010.

There were no public comments.

MEETING ADJOURNED