

**CHARLOTTESVILLE/ALBEMARLE COMMISSION ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES  
MEETING MINUTES  
JANUARY 7, 2004  
ALBEMARLE COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING, ROOM 246**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Martha Carroll, 16<sup>th</sup> District Court Service Unit  
Dr. Kevin Castner, Albemarle County Schools  
Shirley Copeland, Albemarle Citizen Representative  
Robert Cox, Charlottesville Dept. of Social Services  
Madison Cummings, Albemarle Citizen Representative  
Dr. Michael Dickens, Charlottesville Citizen Representative  
Leslie Harris-Scott, Charlottesville Citizen Representative  
Timothy, Heaphy, Charlottesville Citizen Representative  
Mark Kindler, Albemarle Citizen Representative  
Winx Lawrence, University of Virginia  
Dr. Susan McLeod, Thomas Jefferson Health District  
Jim Peterson, Region Ten Community Services Board  
Jessica Rafter, Charlottesville Youth Representative  
Kathy Ralston, Chair, Albemarle Department of Social Services  
Noah Schwartz, Monticello Area Community Action Agency  
Cathy Train, United Way-Thomas Jefferson Area  
Roxanne White, Albemarle County  
Danielle Wilcox, Charlottesville Citizen Representative

**MEMBERS NOT PRESENT**

Ron Hutchinson, Charlottesville City Schools  
Linda Peacock, City of Charlottesville  
Sade Ridley, Albemarle Youth Representative  
Sterling Robinson, Albemarle Citizen Representative

**CCF STAFF PRESENT**

Saphira Baker, Director  
Rory Carpenter, Juvenile Justice Coordinator  
Gretchen Ellis, Planner  
Linda Rahman, Program Assistant  
Cindy Stratton, CSA Coordinator

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Jonathan Earl, Albemarle County Police Department  
Jack Gallagher  
Lisa Kelley, Charlottesville City Attorney's Office  
Mike Murphy, Community Attention  
Dasretta Sapp,  
Ruth Stone, CASA  
Jeff Thomas, IMC  
Tom von Hemert, Thomas Jefferson Area Criminal Justice Board

**HANDOUTS (prior to meeting)**

Agenda for January 7, 2004 CCF meeting  
December 3, 2003 meeting minutes  
Director's Report  
Information Sharing Sub-Committee Report  
CNES Workgroup Report and Appendices  
Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) Monthly Meeting Minutes  
Charlottesville CSA Summary Financial Report for November 2003  
Albemarle CSA Summary Financial Report for November 2003

**HANDOUTS (during meeting)**

Corrected Charlottesville CSA Summary Financial Report for November 2003  
Corrected Albemarle CSA Summary Financial Report for November 2003  
CNES Workgroup Report – attachment G, CSA Care Coordinator  
Juvenile Justice "Guide"

**I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

K. Ralston, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:05pm and welcomed commissioners and others present. She introduced the new commissioner, Timothy Heaphy. Mr. Heaphy is new to Charlottesville. He recently moved from Washington DC. Mr. Heaphy works for the U.S. Attorney's office in the central Virginia area. For the past ten years, he has been a criminal prosecutor. He has two small children and is looking forward to working with children's issues.

**II. SPECIFICATION OF ITEMS TO BE ADDED AND ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

- ◆ **THE COMMISSION ADOPTED THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING WITH NO ADDITIONS OR CHANGES.**

**III. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

There were no comments from the public heard.

**IV. MINUTES FROM THE CCF MEETING FOR DECEMBER 3, 2003**

A motion to approve the minutes was made by S. McLeod and seconded by M. Cummings.

- ◆ **THE COMMISSION APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 CCF MEETING WITH NO CHANGES OR ADDITIONS.**

**V. INFORMATION SHARING REPORT – RORY CARPENTER, RUTH STONE**

R. Stone updated the CCF Commission on the progress made by the Information Sharing Subcommittee. The subcommittee has worked on this project since January of 2000 and has developed a plan to improve information sharing between Charlottesville and Albemarle agencies. The subcommittee does not see this as a change in policy, as agencies are already participating in some of this, but as a change in conduit – process conduit instead of policy shift. The subcommittee feels this is going to take a lot of work – specifically structural changes within agencies in order for the project to succeed and has specific suggestions for CCF action steps. While the subcommittee understands there are barriers that need to be addressed, their overwhelming opinion is that CCF can and should make significant improvements to interagency information sharing. These improvements will benefit both clients and agencies while saving time and money.

The Information Sharing Subcommittee gathered data regarding the level of multi-agency involvement among children in the human service system and actual casework examples of the duplication of effort that takes place and the disruption and family confusion that often occurs in the current system. The data showed that of the 127 participants in Community Attention programs, these participants were also involved with up to 7 agencies in addition to Community Attention; 263 juvenile offenders were also involved with as many as 14 other agencies in addition to the Court Service Unit; and of the 11 children whose files were studied for the CSA Cost Containment Subcommittee, these children also had contact with up to 17 other agencies. Casework examples are described in the report.

Benefits of the improved interagency information sharing include:

- Cost savings
- Reduction in client frustration

- Comprehensive interagency assessments lead to more timely and appropriate interventions
- More effective emergency interventions
- Standardize information sharing practice
- “Up front” needs assessment and planning data
- Empowers clients
- Improved partnerships between clients and community agencies
- Improved compliance with existing laws and regulations

R. Stone noted that there were confidentiality barriers that would need to be addressed. Client confidentiality could be compromised through improper access to client data. All agencies would need to operate under the same rules. Also needing to be addressed is increased workload with time consuming and cumbersome data entry along with the expense to develop and maintain the system.

R. Stone asked the CCF Commissioners to endorse three recommended steps:

1. Designate/appoint a person in each CCF member agency at the supervisor level to actively participate in a new Information Sharing implementation work group to move the information-sharing project forward.
2. Consider endorsing in principle a local government mandate that all locally funded public service agencies will actively participate in this new approach to interagency information sharing.
3. Ask the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee to allot available JAIBG funds to help support staffing, fund raising efforts and implementation of the project.

The commissioners had several questions regarding the scope of where we would start from and who the clients would be. S. McLeod noted that some agencies have large numbers of children whereas schools have smaller numbers involved. R. Carpenter stated they would like to start with a sub-set of clients from public agencies. R. Stone suggested a sub-set group of foster care children as they have several agencies working with them, yet felt it was best if the new workgroup could designate whom to start with. W. Lawrence suggested starting information sharing with a small group, gradually building, supporting and amending to show its importance. R. White commented that when the Commission was started, one of our roles was to share our information. She is surprised that Commissioners have to convince ourselves that information sharing is needed. B. Cox questioned why larger agencies were not represented on this sub-committee. He felt they would have questions and should be in the planning stages. S. Baker informed this was a sub-committee of the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee, where large agencies are represented. She noted that the JJAC has overseen the sub-committee and approved the report and recommendations. M. Carroll inquired about using JAIBG funds, and asked if it would be allowed. R. Carpenter advised that JAIBG funds could be used as long as the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee agreed. These funds would only be enough to get us to level one; other funds would be needed for level two and beyond. He has received an offer from a private organization (IMC) to help with computer implementation – that would be in the next level. R. Carpenter stated that an analysis has not been done on what assessment questions are being asked by agencies currently. W. Lawrence agreed we should endorse to go to the next step of finding out who the clients would be and what information should be shared. She felt this was a great start and that we need to continue. M. Cummings stated he felt that information sharing made good sense but that confidentiality must be ensured. He inquired if the Commission should seek the opinion from the city attorney. L. Kelley, who is with the city attorney’s office and a member of the sub-committee advised it was a primary issue that has to be addressed and that the current system design would allow for confidentiality. She noted the need to focus on a safe and reliable way to put basic mechanisms out there, for all to know other agencies are involved. She felt this could be done without breaking any confidentiality laws. She suggested deciding on a sub-set and agencies; limiting the information that is shared; having release forms signed and each agency should work with their attorneys. This would be involved in stage two of the planning.

K. Ralston informed the Commissioners the allotted discussion time for this agenda item has passed. It was agreed by the Commissioners to extend the comments past the allotted time.

N. Schwartz inquired about where the computer would be located to enter the data. R. Carpenter informed the Commission that it could be located in the Juvenile Justice office with CCF. M. Dickens stated that, with regards to the amount of information, it would have to be substantial in order for the system to work. J. Peterson questioned the type of information that would be allowed before civil exposure being subject to criminal penalties – particularly with regard to HIPPA regulations. N. Schwartz expressed his concerns with blind releases. He doubted his clients would sign them. R. White suggested getting IT support from the County and City.

A motion to endorse recommendations number one and three and the new workgroup charge to state that the subset would be limited to those clients who are eligible for JAIBG and determined by the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee was made by S. McLeod and seconded by B. Cox. The motion was presented to the commissioners for a vote. Seven members voted for the motion, nine were against. The motion was defeated.

A motion to endorse recommendations number one and three and have the workgroup charge state that the workgroup would decide on what subset would be included in this initial pilot group and their plan for implementation would be brought back to the Commission for approval was made by R. White and seconded by M. Carroll. The motion was presented to the Commissioners for a vote. 16 in favor, one against, one abstention.

- ◆ **THE COMMISSION APPROVED THE RECOMMENDATION TO 1) DESIGNATE/APPOINT A PERSON IN EACH CCF MEMBER AGENCY AT THE SUPERVISOR LEVEL TO ACTIVELY PARTICIPATE IN A NEW INFORMATION SHARING IMPLEMENTATION WORK GROUP TO MOVE THE INFORMATION-SHARING PROJECT FORWARD; 2) ASK THE JUVENILE JUSTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO ALLOT AVAILABLE JAIBG FUNDS TO HELP SUPPORT STAFFING, FUND-RAISING EFFORTS AND IMPLEMENTION OF THE PROJECT; AND 3) HAVE THE NEW INFORMATION SHARING IMPLEMENTATION WORK GROUP DECIDE ON WHAT SUBSET WOULD BE INCLUDED IN THIS INITIAL PILOT GROUP AND DEVELOP A CHARGE AND IMPLEMENTATION STEPS TO BE BROUGHT BACK TO THE COMMISSION FOR APPROVAL.**

## **VI. CNES WORK GROUP REPORT – K. RALSTON**

K. Ralston noted that this report is brought to the CCF Commissioners as information only as the Children Needing Extensive Services (CNES) Work Group is under the direction of the Comprehensive Service Act (CSA) Committee of CCF and the CNES Report was presented to the CSA Committee at their meeting last month and approved.

K. Ralston stated that, in 1998, Charlottesville/Albemarle Commission on Children and Families members identified Children Needing Extensive Services (CNES) as a priority issue. The original charge to the group was to: Analyze and track the local population needing the most extensive services (primarily funded through CSA) and make recommendations on their current and future service needs. Members defined these children as: “Children poised to harm themselves or others and likely to require costly out of home placements and innovative treatment programs currently served by one or more agencies on the CSA committee or children currently unknown to these same systems but either they or their families exhibit similar behavior patterns.” To address this priority, the CSA Committee was charged with the development of a CNES work group. This report summarizes the status of the initiatives undertaken by CNES members, and presents specific recommendations to the CCF. The recommendations are: 1) continue a Consultant Panel of expert professionals; 2) Establish a Care Coordinator Service; 3) Explore a Secure Communications web site; and 4) Create a “Virtual Residential” Program.

K. Ralston further noted that continuing with a consultant panel of expert professionals would be for one year on a pilot basis. Having a panel of expert professionals and videotaping the panel would allow for a review of the discussion without extensive note taking and also provide a training opportunity for other case managers. This panel would also act like the family a child does not have.

A Care Coordinator would be a highly trained and experienced clinician who is assigned a relatively small caseload of children receiving intensive CSA services. The care coordinator will augment the services of the case manager and relieve the case manager from an extensive amount of work.

The development of a secure web-based communications system would provide a secure and accessible process for timely consultations and case management brainstorming. CryptoHeaven is a secure communications and storage space provider. Messages and documents sent through or stored on their system are private and confidential. Files are securely stored “for your eyes only” viewing. (see attachment “H”).

Virtual Residential is defined as a coordinated, child specific set of services which “wrap-around” a child in such an intensive, comprehensive fashion as to emulate a residential setting in the home community, changing over time as the child’s needs change. Children need the structure of a residential setting before going home. The cost for virtual residential is as high as residential services. In addition, additional staff will be required.

K. Ralston noted that page 12 of the report includes the status of recommendations to date. Eight of the recommendations have been accomplished. Number five and thirteen have not been accomplished. K. Ralston also highlighted the acknowledgements on page two, and presented this as a “close-out” report. She underscored that there are no easy solutions, and that the work group focused on service and not cost. There is cost involved to make children whole again and productive citizens.

Susan McLeod stated that she felt the definition of Children Needing Extensive Services is fairly loose. She asked: Is that the best definition? K. Ralston referred Dr. McLeod to attachment “J” for a more complete description of CNES. There are approximately 50 CNES cases in Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville, one out of ten children with a minimum cost of \$150,000 per year. The average ages are 14-17 (actually younger in the city of Charlottesville).

The Commissioners discussed the benefits of virtual residence and the difficulty in finding foster homes.

Buz Cox commented on how hard the CNES Subcommittee worked and noted that their report is top notch. They should be commended.

## **VII. CSA COMMITTEE STATUS REPORT – B. COX**

B. Cox reported that CSA is a mechanism and funding source and a report on financial responsibilities and cases is issued each month. Some months ago we stopped verbally reporting the findings with the Commissioners, however, the CCF Executive Committee would like a verbal report given to the commissioners on a quarterly basis. B. Cox reported that 645 children were served last year in the city and county. That was a 10% decrease for Albemarle County and a 10% increase for the city of Charlottesville. The average increase is 19% for Albemarle and 8% for Charlottesville. Year-to-date, both localities show a decrease in the numbers served year-to-date. He did not receive the report on the most difficult and expensive cases reviewed, as that report needs prior approval by CART. He will have that report next month. B. Cox reported that in the financial area, Albemarle County is flat with last year and Charlottesville has a 7% increase. Both localities had big increases last year. W. Lawrence asked if we knew why the

count was going down in the county. B. Cox explained the city has more foster care cases. K. Ralston commented that the Department of Social Services is receiving children at a much younger age. B. Cox commented that the city foster care did not grow last year and hoped that foster care prevention was the reason why. He also advised both the city and county are predicting lower expenditures. K. Ralston commented that there was also a change in judges. The new judge prefers foster care and we will see a change in numbers for older kids. B. Cox reported there are three ongoing challenges: 1) how to meet mandated services; 2) how to manage and control costs; and 3) the burden of administration with bare-bone staffing. S. Baker commented that the City Council did ask for a report on CSA and she and Buz Cox would be reporting to the City Council later this month on the 20<sup>th</sup> on cost containment and that Paul McWhinney was meeting with the board of supervisors regarding cost containment on February 4<sup>th</sup>. The Cost Containment meeting is working to begin sorting and implementing the recommendations.

#### **VIII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT – S. BAKER**

S. Baker remarked how she is continuously overwhelmed and impressed by the performance of the work groups.

S. Baker reported she wanted to briefly touch on some points in the Director's report. The CCF's 3<sup>rd</sup> annual Legislative Forum on Children and Families held on December 16<sup>th</sup> was a success. The attendance was great, approximately 130 participants. The evaluation results showed 90% of respondents reported that the forum increased their knowledge of issues facing local children and families; 84% reported that the forum increased their understanding of the legislators' priority issues; and 100% reported that the forum was informative or very informative. The difference in this year's forum was that the legislators took a stand on issues in response to structured questions. We received extensive media coverage of the event and the predominance of "working poor" in Virginia on Channel 29 news. We also received coverage in the *Tribune*.

S. Baker stated she is preparing for a presentation to the Albemarle County School Board, January 8<sup>th</sup>. All Commissioners are invited to attend; meeting begins at 6:30pm. On February 4<sup>th</sup> she will be making a presentation on common findings and directions to the Donor's Roundtable, hosted by the Charlottesville/Albemarle Community Foundation.

S. Baker distributed to the Commissioners their copy of the new Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee's *Juvenile Court Guide*. Gretchen Ellis, the CCF Planner, wrote the report and Amber Zavada, CCF Outreach Coordinator designed the guide. W. Lawrence inquired if the guides were available in the courts. S. Baker responded that they would be. They will be distributed widely after they are presented at the Juvenile Court round table on January 29<sup>th</sup>.

#### **IX. MEMBERS' COMMENTS**

R. White stated she was really impressed with the group of people who attended the Legislative Forum – it was standing room only! S. Baker noted that a wide variety of people who attended. There is a summary of the Legislative Forum results on the CCF website <http://www.ccfinfo.org> K. Ralston commended the CCF staff for their great work with the legislative forum. Especially in light that some of the legislators dropped out a few weeks before due to impromptu Caucus meetings. Commissioners discussed moving the legislative forum to another time that would be better for the legislators. S. Baker commented that legislators had suggested May would be a better time, yet a number of Commissioners noted that November would be a better time to make legislators aware of what we want.

The meeting adjourned at 6:55p.m.

**THE NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION WILL BE  
FEBRUARY 4, 2004  
ROOM 235 OF THE ALBEMARLE COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING**