

CHARLOTTESVILLE/ALBEMARLE COMMISSION ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
MEETING MINUTES
March 2, 2005
ACOB-5TH STREET, CCF CONFERENCE ROOM

MEMBERS PRESENT

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
Tracey Hopper, Albemarle Citizen
Representative
Linda Peacock, City of Charlottesville
Kathy Ralston, Chair, Albemarle Department of
Social Services
Alia Stewart-Silver, Charlottesville Youth
Representative
Roxanne White, Albemarle County
Danielle Wilcox, Charlottesville Citizen
Representative

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT

Phil Campbell, Region Ten Community Services
Board
Martha Carroll, 16th District Court Service Unit
Dr. Scottie Griffin, Charlottesville City Schools
Winx Lawrence, University of Virginia
Dr. Susan McLeod, Thomas Jefferson Health District
Sterling Robinson, Albemarle Citizen Representative
Noah Schwartz, Monticello Area Community Action
Agency
Cathy Train, United Way-Thomas Jefferson Area
Kim Walters, Albemarle Youth Representative

CCF STAFF PRESENT

Saphira Baker, Director
Linda Rahman, Program Assistant
Cindy Stratton, CSA Coordinator

OTHERS PRESENT

Gertrude Ivory, Associate Superintendent in
attendance for Dr. Scottie Griffin
Andy Block, Just Children

HANDOUTS (prior to meeting)

Agenda for March 2, 2005 CCF meeting
February 2, 2005 CCF meeting minutes
Director's Report
Charlottesville CSA Summary Financial Report
Albemarle CSA Summary Financial Report
CSA CART Cases
CSA Meeting Minutes

HANDOUTS (during meeting)

CSA Quarterly Report (2nd Quarter)
Position Description for CSA Utilization Review
Manager
2005 CSA Revised Program Structure
Representations and Charges
4 Roles of the CCF
Memo to Work Groups RE: Advancing
Recommendations for Children and Families
Proposed Draft of CCF Calendar
Criteria for Determining CCF Priority
Recommendations
Memo to CCF Members RE: Planning Direction for
Discussion

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

K. Ralston, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m. and welcomed Commissioners and Ms. Gertrude Ivory, Associate Superintendent of Charlottesville City Schools, in attendance for Dr. Scottie Griffin.

II. SPECIFICATION OF ITEMS TO BE ADDED TO AGENDA

No agenda items were added. A motion to approve the March 2, 2005 agenda was made by Madison Cummings and seconded by Roxanne White.

◆ THE COMMISSION APPROVED THE AGENDA OF THE MARCH 2, 2005 CCF MEETING.

III. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Andy Block, with Just Children, spoke about his opposing view to the Child Advocacy Center (CAC) Report recently released by the Commission and urged the Commissioners to reconsider spending their time and resources in making the Child Advocacy Center a reality. He stated his four objections to pursuing the CAC are:

1. He believes it doesn't fix the problem of child abuse nor does it encourage ways to prevent violence or intervention.
2. He believes that a lot of the problems identified in the report could be addressed without a CAC if there was better coordination among agencies, doctors and Commonwealth Attorneys to prevent children from repeating their stories and re-living the trauma. He stated that Coordination of Services should be addressed through the Family Assessment Planning Team.
3. He believes there are better strategies to address the problems of child abuse in this community that may not be as appealing, but more effective of the Commissions' time and community's money. He stated that one strategy is to prevent the Bright Stars program from closing due to reduced funding, as he believes it is a prevention program that works. A. Block stated that the Commission should be spending time and energy on keeping that program going, as studies have shown that effective, comprehensive pre-schools for children address the achievement gap and prevent violence when started as early as three years old. Studies have also found that these programs have family support services as part of them, which reduces incidents of child abuse, reduces the reliance on social services, as the kids get older, and it promotes academic achievement. A. Block believes if the Commission would devote their time and energy on a program like that, it would go a lot further than a CAC and it would address what Mr. Block sees as the most compelling problem, particularly in the City: low-income kids, and children of color, are falling below white, middle class children academically. Another is having more foster care prevention workers to provide support for families in crisis.
4. He fears that this community would be lulled into thinking that the problem of child abuse has been fixed when the CAC opens, when, in fact, it has not.

K. Ralston thanked Andy Block for his comments and stated that the Commission would take them under advisement and review them at the next Commission meeting.

IV. MINUTES FROM THE CCF MEETING FOR FEBRUARY 2, 2005

A motion to approve the February 2, 2005 minutes was made by Madison Cummings and seconded by Tracy Hopper. B Cox made the following change:

- On page 5, change his comments from “influence the Agency Budget Review Process” to “influence funding decisions for their programs”.

M. Cummings made the following change:

- On page 5, change “whey” to “they”.

◆ THE COMMISSION APPROVED THE AMENDED MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 2, 2005 CCF MEETINGS.

V. UPDATES ON POST-RETREAT ASSIGNMENTS

A. REPORT FROM REDESIGN WORK GROUP

K. Ralston gave a brief overview of the events at the October, 2004 Retreat and the meeting between the Executive Committee and the Re-design/Re-structuring group. She stated that the drafts presented to the Commissioners were for members’ review and to determine if they were on the right track. She turned the presentation over to T. Heaphy.

T. Heaphy stated that a small group of Commissioners were charged with taking what was discussed at the retreat and putting it on paper. He reported that they had informally met, reached a consensus of the message from the retreat and came up with a process of how to prioritize amount CCF issues and get children and family issues on the City Council and Board of Supervisor’s radar screen. T. Heaphy reviewed the revised “Four Roles of the Charlottesville/Albemarle Commission on Children and Families” (see attachment 1) and stated that a major change was made to the role of Catalyst; there are now two specific ways to improve the impact of initiatives. He stated that only small revisions were made to the other roles. He also reviewed the “memo to work groups” that the group drafted (see attachment 2). T. Heaphy stated that, in addition, the group put down on paper a timeline for the process (see 2006 CCF Calendar – Proposed Draft, attachment 3). He stated that certain things had still not been resolved. One issue is the criteria the Commission should apply to the decisions about priority recommendations. He reported that the group drafted the “Criteria For Determining CCF Priority Recommendation(s)” (see attachment 4) which needs further discussion by the Commission and that the other issue is resources and organizational capacity to implement the Commissioners’ goals. T. Heaphy stated that the group is looking for feedback from the Commissioners on this presentation.

B. CCF ORGANIZATIONAL AND STRATEGIC PLANNING OPTIONS

K. Ralston stated that in the second phase, the group brought this to the Executive Committee and the Redesign Team, which had a lengthy discussion and developed a planning direction for the Commission (see attachment 5). K. Ralston reviewed the memo with the Commissioners and stated that the Executive Committee concluded that the Commission had stayed consistent in members’ vision and clear on their goals. She stated that the Commission continued to be

focused, but did not have the resources or organizational capacity to achieve its goals. She also reported that the Executive Committee concluded that the Commission's position in local government did not lend itself to integrated communication and planning for children and family services. Generally, she noted that the Team believed the Commission's charter and purpose are clear, and now with the work from the Re-design/Re-structure work group, CCF has the means for advancing priority issues.

K. Ralston reviewed the achievements and accomplishments of the Commission and noted that there has been a gradual shift of CCF staff's time away from some of the discretionary things that are visionary, with more emphasis on CSA, VJCCA and ABRT. She noted that these areas are still seen as important but, however, are not identified as core functions by the majority of CCF members per surveys that have been completed and feedback that has been received. K. Ralston stated that the Executive Committee proposes two scenarios: 1) to cut back on discretionary services and beef-up the mandated services, however, this would not reflect the majority of the Commission members' vision, or 2) Expand CCF's capacity to accomplish its mandated and desired outcomes. She noted that in order to do that, however, it would require developing public-private partnerships, potentially seeking public sector and private foundation grants, and possibly establishing a non-profit arm to raise funds.

K. Ralston asked the Commissioners to reflect on the work that has been done and to give the Executive Committee either feedback, further direction, or approve the initiatives of the Re-design/Re-structuring work group. She opened the floor to discussion.

R. White mentioned she did not feel it was outside the CCF charter to look for other funding sources. T. Heaphy stated he believed the Commission should aggressively look at expanding our capacity in an organized way and that the Commission's next steps should be to look at how we are going to raise more money. The Commissioners discussed the effects of State and Federal government downsizing and the need for more private and local funds. S. Baker reviewed the costs involved for CSA and JJAC and she noted that, locally, CCF has not competed with local agencies for funds but has helped public, non-profit agencies raise money. She stated that CCF has had some success with fundraising, grants, and finding local donors for its own work without much effort. She believes that our resource needs are modest and with some research, capital can be generated. Members discussed non-profit agencies' willingness to pay membership fees, community residents donating private dollars and the barriers, if any, for looking for money. K. Ralston clarified that CCF was exploring establishing a non-profit, and possibly adding people to the Board that might help funnel these resources if we want to expand CCF's capacity. S. Baker advised that CCF is a division of the City Manager's Office and is not set-up to raise non-profit funds currently. She further stated that we are an advisory to local government and there is no one on CCF's staff who has ever been focused on development of fundraising for the organization. She discussed how the CSA, JJAC and CCF funding operates and if there are any cuts in funding for CSA or JJAC, CCF dollars fill in for those cuts, thus additional initiatives are effected.

Members discussed the mandated role of CCF, the charter, and how this new fundraising arm might be raising money for special projects outside of CCF's current operational budget.

K. Ralston inquired if the Commissioners believed CCF is moving in the right direction and does not need a strategic plan. After discussion, there was a consensus among Commissioners to focus on scenario number two (Expand CCF's capacity) and for the Executive Committee to come back next month with an update.

VI. CSA QUARTERLY REPORT

B. Cox reviewed the Comprehensive Services Act Committee Quarterly Report with the Commissioners (see attached report). He reported that Albemarle County is reviewing the numbers they reported for children and families served year-to-date for correctness. B. Cox stated that the City and County projected level spending for this year. He reported that the new CSA Committee structure had been implemented as recommended in the Cost Containment study and Ron Lee had been hired as the new Utilization Review Manager. B. Cox gave the Commissioners background on Mr. Lee and stated that his office would be located at CCF but Region Ten would supervise Mr. Lee. B. Cox discussed BH2296, a bill that was introduced that would have included funding any child in the community who needed residential services – not only those in foster care. He stated that though the bill was defeated due to costs, the group is still working on the bill.

VII. AGENCY BUDGET REVIEW TEAM REPORT

R. White gave a brief overview of the twelve-member team who reviews the agency applications and recognized the members of the Commission who are on the Agency Budget Review Team. She stated that the primary goal of the team was to link outcome measurement and rank agencies on a four-point scale. Commissioners were asked to look at the spreadsheet and R. White stated that the team was asked to keep within the 3% increase. She stated that those agencies that were rated “Excellent”, received a 4% increase, “Good” received a 2% increase and “Fair” received level funding. She reported that the team made recommendations on 2.5 million dollars and that the process was difficult with lots of good agencies and programs. She stated that the report had a very complete introduction with extensive summaries on each agency and thanked everyone on the team for their hard work. L. Peacock reported that recommendations had been forwarded and the final decision would be up to the City Council and County Board of Supervisors.

VIII. DIRECTORS REPORT

S. Baker reported that she met with Mike Svetz, City Parks and Recreation Director, to discuss his Youth Council concept and its relation to the Assets for Youth work group recommendations. She stated that Mr. Svetz would be involved in the Assets for Youth Implementation work group. L. Harris-Scott also noted that Mr. Svetz would be working with the youth of the community on careers with the Parks and Recreation Department and filling summer jobs with local youth.

K. Ralston stated that she was excited to learn the CCF received training and orientation on “Team Services” software from the County IT Department as this will allow the Commission to archive their meeting minutes. S. Baker spoke about the differences between Team Services software and the CCF website.

IX. MEMBERS COMMENTS

No comments were made.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

THE NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION WILL BE

MAY 4, 2005
IN THE ALBEMARLE COUNTY 5TH STREET OFFICE BUILDING
CCF CONFERENCE ROOM

Attachment 1

4 Roles of the Charlottesville/Albemarle Commission on Children and Families

Advisor --

General Definition: Advises Board, Council, other governmental entities, public and non-profit human services agencies and community with timely, well-informed, accurate and pertinent information. **Serves two essential functions for policymakers:**

1) **Provides general information about issues affecting children and families in our community, documenting both success of existing programs and identifying needs for future attention; responds to inquiries by City and County executive leadership regarding specific issues;** gives information about what has been done.

2) **Manages budget review process, specifically recommending funding priorities and suggesting allocations to individual organizations which depend upon government funding to serve the needs of families and children.**

CCF Advisor Outcomes: Local government **understands and prioritizes** needed supports for children and their families. **Legislative activity and** investments in community agencies target identified needs. Funds are used efficiently and effectively.

Catalyst --

General Definition: Makes something that is happening, happen faster. **Generates interest in new programs and initiatives.** Improves impact of initiatives **in two specific ways:**

1) Reaches new players to put children and family issues on the “radar screen” for a broader audience; **educates the public and policy-makers regarding issues affecting children and families; assists in pursuing sources of funding for family support programs.**

2) **Funnels information about existing programs and community-wide needs into specific, prioritized recommendations for change; makes limited, annual recommendations to Board and Council regarding individual programs and other endeavors which, in the opinion of the Commission, deserve priority; champions those prioritized issues by providing specific recommendations as to implementation, including estimating costs and identifying other necessary steps toward implementation.**

CCF Catalyst Outcomes: Decision makers and citizens use CCF information to make informed decisions and respond to issues impacting children and their families; CCF is known for initiating positive change. Stakeholders are brought to the table with the capacity to implement change. Community resources are targeted and desired outcomes are achieved **in areas of identified need.**

Information Source –

General Definition: An informed repository of accurate and reliable knowledge. Determines questions to be addressed, creates data and information, generates it. Educates public and policy makers in **three** specific ways:

1) **Assembles and supports work groups which marshal community resources working to address specific, identified issues of importance to children and families; solicits recommendations from work groups and other individuals or organizations regarding individual programs, funding needs, and other gaps in service which deserve prioritized attention from policy makers;**

2) **Solicits information from community groups and individuals impacted by services provided; invites input from those groups and individuals regarding prioritization of specific programs and needs.**

3) **Through professional staff, collects data and performs and sponsors research into effectiveness, feasibility, cost and potential impact of existing and potential support programs on lives of local children and families.**

CCF Information Source Outcomes: Agencies, governing bodies, and other entities have reliable accurate information from CCF on needs. City and County strategic planning for children and families is informed by CCF research and information. **Individuals directly affected by children and family services have ample opportunity to inform decisions as to prioritized needs.**

Coordinator --

General Definition: Convener; assumes that related events happen in sequence and efficiently. Understands how pieces fit into the whole system and the various responsibilities of area organizations. **Facilitates cooperation between service components in two specific ways:**

1) Has effective communication with all players in the system; **encourages participation by service providers in work groups engaged in specific areas; facilitates strategic coordination between service providers to increase leverage in achieving joint goals.**

2) Assures direction of resources in right amount and place; **gathers information from service providers and work groups regarding relative needs; solicits input regarding Commission priorities from all interested parties.**

CCF Coordinator Outcomes: Resources are targeted for the most impact. Needs of children are identified and a plan to address them is implemented. Services are seamless and complement one another.

Attachment 2

To: Work Groups

From: Commission

Date: January 28, 2005

Re: Advancing recommendations for children and families

This year the Commission has decided to proceed differently regarding setting priorities for recommendations to local and state government. At the Commission's Retreat on October 27, 2004, the consensus of Commissioners was to further develop its catalyst function so that each year prioritized recommendations are identified, and a plan of action is created to assist with implementing policy, programs, and resources for addressing this priority. As a catalyst for change, the Commission throughout the year would champion and provide leadership regarding matters related to this recommendation; its success in this role would be evaluated at the conclusion of each year.

Our hope is that, while the work groups and other roles of the Commission continue their excellent, important work, we also will be able to further additional constructive change based on focusing on one priority action item (possibly identified as a result of the research and recommendations of work groups). Hence, one of the reasons we are writing to you is to request that you provide feedback, if you would like, regarding particular recommendations you might have identified, as well as an outline of components of the issue, an implementation plan and timeline for furthering the goal of providing concentrated focus on this area. Please do not feel that you are required to identify a priority recommendation or provide this detailed feedback. Instead, you are being invited to participate if you have identified a pressing issue that you believe should be a priority upon which the Commission should focus.

The Commission will examine the various proposals from the work groups and other sources, and then decide upon the priority recommendation for the upcoming year. It is important to emphasize that regardless of what "priority" is identified, the other roles of the Commission and the other matters tackled by work groups continue to be vitally important to our community and our mission. We merely are adding another component to what the Commission does in order to attempt to provide positive outcomes for families and children more effectively and efficiently. Please find attached for your review the restated definition of the Commission's catalyst role, as well as a timeline for the process.

Thank you for your excellence, commitment and dedication, and for taking on this additional task.

Attachment 3

2006	CCF Calendar – Proposed Draft
January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Groups Underway • CCF research underway
February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Groups Underway • CCF research underway
March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call for Recommendations Issued to CCF Work Groups, CCF members and the general public
April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitations for annual meeting out • Deadline to work groups for submitting recommendations
May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Meeting held with opportunity for overview on “state of children and their families”, local progress on addressing needs, and dialogue on specific recommendations.
June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCF member pick one or two recommendations to advance for upcoming fiscal year, July – June. Prioritized recommendations may be pursued over a multi-year period.
July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCF Planning staff develop Level 3 detail for selected recommendation (s) (<i>refers to Level 3 work group template from CCF retreat which includes detail on costs, agreements from partners, and resource development strategies.</i>)
August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCF Planning staff continue to develop one or two “Level 3” recommendations • CCF Information and Outreach Coordinator creates a communication packet (report, visuals) to accompany recommendation (s) • CCF Board members develop community champions for recommendation(s)
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCF members hold retreat to develop strategies for advancing Level 3 priority recommendation (s) and identify areas for further research. • CCF members identify work groups for upcoming year, and identify areas for future study or attention based on data. • Raise funds for Strategic Initiatives Fund to further recommendations • CCF celebrates end of previous work groups that have completed their work.
October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation to City Council and Board of Supervisors with Level 3 Priority Recommendation(s) with budget request if necessary • CCF charges new or existing work groups to begin and/or continue research and development for future study and/or recommendations
November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation to community and civic organizations for Priority Recommendation(s)
December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCF Work Groups underway • CCF research underway

Attachment 4

CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING CCF PRIORITY RECOMMENDATION(S)

COMPELLING LOCAL NEED

- Do residents need/want this recommendation/initiative?
- Is this a recommendation/theme that generates universal concern?
- Does this recommendation/initiative respond to recent changes in our community, as indicated by demographic and other data? Do prior local needs assessments point to this recommendation as a priority?
- Is there a gap in services related to this recommendation?
- Does this recommendation help the community prepare for upcoming trends (based on local and national analysis) and build on research of what works?

BUILDS ON EXISTING RESOURCES

- Can CCF add value to the current spectrum/organization of services through this recommendation?
- Will a community theme based on this recommendation build on existing pilots?
- For this first year, can this recommendation be addressed by a diversity of children and family serving institutions?
- How much time and resources are members willing to put into furtherance of and implementation of this recommendation?
- What specific resources are there on which we can count?
- Are CCF members will to dedicate time and resources to this recommendation?

CREATES OR BUILDS ON PUBLIC AWARENESS

- Is this a recommendation/issue where more community knowledge/attention would be helpful?
- Is this a recommendation/issue where there is significant public awareness already that could be tapped for a focused initiative?

EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION

- Can components of this recommendation be realized within a relatively short time frame?
- Can we measure our success and be held accountable for specific outcomes identified ahead of time related to this recommendation?

Attachment 5

To: CCF Members
From: Executive Committee members
Re: Planning Direction for discussion
Date: February 28, 2005

Members of the Executive Committee and members of the "Redesign Work Group" met to coordinate their work and put forth a recommendation, as charged by CCF, for the next stage of planning for CCF.

We believe that we need to think strategically about our future direction, yet not embark on a strategic planning process. Specifically, we recommend adopting the Redesign Work Group's proposal for setting priorities, developing new resources to pursue goals that have been consistent over time, and clarifying localities' goals for CCF to inform future resource development and structure.

1. Setting Priorities

The Redesign Work Group has put forth a solid recommendation for addressing the primary concern voiced at the CCF retreat; the need to set priorities among competing issues in order for CCF to have more impact on policy and programs. We believe that this proposed structure for choosing and advancing prioritized recommendations will strengthen the CCF's impact and lead to greater success in bringing about needed and measurable changes in child and family conditions.

2. SETTING GOALS AND VISION

After reviewing records of prior retreats and organizational documents – such as CCF's charter, roles and vision – we have come to the conclusion that there has been a consistent vision for the CCF among its members and clear roles for implementation. The stumbling block for our organization is not so much a lack of focus, but a lack of resources and organizational capacity to implement the Commissioners' goals as put forth over the years. Further, our position within the local governments does not lend itself to integrated communication and planning for children and family services. Our charter and purpose are clear, and now we have a means for advancing priority issues. What follows are examples of what Commissioners have repeatedly said we would like to achieve:

- Members have consistently stated that they want CCF to be more visible in raising awareness about children's needs, and advancing policies and programs that support children and their families. A number one priority over several years of retreats and work sessions has been to "raise awareness of children's needs in priority areas."
- CCF's adopted priority issues have been consistent and based on data and community needs. In 1999, members chose to focus on early childhood and children with extensive needs. In 2002 this thread was continued with the designation of four focus areas- "safe and supportive families, children ready to learn (0-6), positive, healthy adolescents, and "a coordinated system of services"- and reflected in our work groups. In 2003 this focus was narrowed based on research to "address productive and healthy activities for adolescents, and decrease the impact of family violence on children".
- Among members, there is consistent support for CCF's four roles -- information source, coordinator, advisor and catalyst. CCF members have deliberated, adopted, and pursued these roles since the October 2002 retreat when they were approved, and the Redesign Work Group has amended them to be even more strategic and strengthen our catalyst role.
- The original responsibility and eight tasks charged to us in 1997 as part of the Joint Agreement between the localities have been accomplished annually and are in keeping with both our four roles and our mandated responsibilities (see below).

3. Local Government Delegated Responsibilities

While within the four roles established in 2002 by the CCF, CCF's administration of "mandated" or delegated responsibilities by the State and localities (CSA administration, VJCCCA, and ABRT administration) have grown steadily as funding for State functions has decreased. There has been a gradual shifting of CCF staff resources and local funding to these areas so that they now absorb well over half of the CCF full and part-time staff time. Historically, these responsibilities were behind the original rationale that created the Commission and are still seen as important and critical by local government funders *though not identified as core functions by the majority of CCF members.*

4. Building Opportunity for Growth

The Executive Committee and Redesign Work Group members have come to the conclusion that local government funds will not be sufficient to sustain and grow the CCF organization; in the last several years CCF has been fortunate that localities have largely made up for federal and State cuts and provided in-kind and emergency help as needed. To implement the Redesign Work Group proposal, for example, is likely to require additional staff time of approximately ten hours a week. Yet, to ask for more local funds does not appear to be realistic in this funding environment.

One response to this scenario is simply to cut back everything discretionary the CCF does, and do the mandated and designated responsibilities – ABRT, CSA, VJCCCA administration – well. All are in need of tending, and could result in improved expenditure of public dollars and well-being of children with additional time dedicated to them. Yet, doing so with the estimated remaining 2 FTEs would make it impossible also to further CCF prioritized recommendations, continue quality research and development of information on children and families, raise awareness of and build support for children's issues, coordinate services and build capacity for improved local services. Further, it would not reflect the majority of Commission members' vision for the organization.

Another option is expand CCF's capacity to accomplish its mandated and desired outcomes. Executive Committee and Redesign Work Group members see the potential of developing increased public-private partnerships in support of CCF as the best and most promising direction. Rather than cutting back on strategic initiatives linked to our data and prioritized recommendations, we recommend exploring public-private partnerships, public sector and private foundation grants, and collaborative partnerships to support the non-mandated components of our mission. Ideas CCF might pursue include the establishment of a non-profit arm, raising funds for a "strategic initiatives pool" to advance recommendations, adding members to the board to assist with this new direction, and exploring whether the current organizational structure within local government is the most expedient for accomplishing CCF's objectives. As part of this direction, other children and family commissions, such as Philadelphia Safe and Sound, and Oregon's local Commissions on Children and Families-- which are funded through a variety of sources and well-integrated into local government and community level decision making--will be explored.

In short, proceed strategically:

- Maintain CCF's focus on providing information and advancing recommendations that improve conditions for children and their families. Use CCF's four roles to guide implementation and strategic growth.
- Adopt the Redesign Work Group's 3-2-05 proposal for identifying prioritized recommendations.
- Explore whether the current organizational structure within local government best facilitates the Commission's vision and roles.
- Create a resource development plan that explores new organizational structures, such as a non-profit arm, foundation status, or partnerships with local foundations to maximize CCF's impact in the community.

Attachment 6

Comprehensive Services Act Committee Quarterly Report to Commission on Children and Families Second Quarter 2005

Children and Families Served Year-to-Date

- Charlottesville: 270 (down 3.57% from last year)
- Albemarle: 249 (up 32.45% from last year)

Cost of Services Year-to-Date

- Charlottesville CSA: \$3,120,805 (up 9.02% from last year)
- Charlottesville Medicaid: \$646,022 (down 7.56 from last year)
- Charlottesville IV-E: \$1,117,561 (down 4% from last year)
- Albemarle CSA: \$2,514,600 (up 12.76% from last year)
- Albemarle Medicaid: \$525,194 (up 87.83% from last year)
- Albemarle IV-E: \$903,433 (up 9.15% from last year)

New CSA Committee Structure Implemented

- As recommended by the 2004 Cost Containment study, committee structure was reviewed and is being reorganized.
- Two new subcommittees of CSA committee established February 2005:
 - Fiscal Subcommittee
 - Program Subcommittee
- New “single” Family Assessment and Planning Team model, implemented July 2005, is operating successfully.
- New structure will facilitate implementation of Cost Containment study recommendations.

New Utilization Review Manager Position Established

- This was a key recommendation of the Cost Containment Study.
- Position established in Region Ten Community Services Board.
- UR Manager will work on cases referred from our CSA system.
- Objectives include ensuring necessity, appropriateness, quality, and cost effectiveness of services provided.

Legislative Issues 2005

- State cut in CSA administrative funding was restored for FY 06.
- HB 2296 to expand CSA mandate was defeated.