

**CHARLOTTESVILLE/ALBEMARLE COMMISSION ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
CSA PROGRAM SUBCOMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 2005
CCF CONFERENCE ROOM
2:30 – 4:30 P.M.**

AGENDA

PRESENT:

Saphira Baker
Barbara Ferrier
John Freeman
Mike Murphy
Dana Neidley
Sue Sheffield
Bob Taibbi

ABSENT:

Carol Zimorski

Approved May 25, 2005

STAFF:

Cindy Stratton

I. Call to Order

J. Freeman, Chair called the meeting to order at 2:46 p.m.

II. Review/Approval of Agenda

Members reviewed the proposed agenda for amendments and additions. S. Baker added an agenda item regarding the CSA Committee's discussion on an upcoming legislative meeting proposal with Delegate Landes. J. Freeman added an agenda item to follow-up on the use of non-mandated funds by the CSB. Item VII.A was removed from the agenda as Bob Taibbi is the newly designated CSB representative to the subcommittee.

III. Approval of Meeting Notes for March 23, 2005

Members reviewed the notes from the March 23rd meeting noting that D. Neidley was absent.

IV. "Communities of Care" Presentation/Discussion – Bob Taibbi

B. Taibbi and S. Baker gave a brief overview of their meeting to discuss the systems of care model subsequent to a presentation he and three other local FAPT members attended on March 23rd in Roanoke. They mutually decided to bring the discussion to the Program Subcommittee for further exploration and action as deemed appropriate. B. Taibbi gave a historical framing of the model since the 1980's, noting that it is similar to other models we have talked about locally; although, tailored to specific communities and family driven to provide for a community based view of children. He distributed copies of the survey they participated in during the one day conference which led to their discussion of parental involvement in the local FAPT process and mental health services in general. He shared his knowledge of a Virginia Beach model wherein assessment and treatment planning is done up front and then case managers are assigned based on service needs. He stated that there are \$2,000 grants available to CSB's to fund support programs (i.e. technical assistance, training, conduct system assessments, etc.). His discussion included options to consider related to whether we needed to walk through the survey, obtain more information or continue at all. There was group discussion on the amount of money available, the willingness of DMH staff to present to the locality, complexity of the issue, specification of the target population to be served, options to utilize the dollars to assist with the development of a local diagnostic and assessment project, local ability/willingness to conduct a roundtable discussion on this issue and its benefits, expectations on sustaining the programs, how the grant project could/would integrate with current CSA issues and

how the survey/assessment process could/would help identify gaps or streamline existing processes. B. Taibbi stated that he had to provide a response regarding our intent within 30 days.

There was additional group discussion about clarifying the definition of the project, how to market it, benefits to families, resources that would be required to implement the grant, how it could help the subcommittee with the direction it desires to go in and what would the state bring to the table.

Members agreed by consensus to pursue the gathering of information and decide whether to continue through the subcommittee or forward to CCF. Specifically, B. Taibbi will find out:

1. What are the benefits, future supports, etc. of the grant/project?
2. Can the dollars be used for start up identified service needs?
3. Clarification on what the system/project is?
4. Can the director come to the locality to present information and answer questions?

V. **Work Plan Discussion**

J. Freeman opened the discussion by outlining the various documents outlining/listing possible subcommittee activities, how they intersect with the subcommittee charge and the need to consolidate them at some point. It was noted that items nine, ten and thirteen of the Cost Containment Report recommendations/strategies have already been identified by the subcommittee as priority issues. S. Baker noted that numbers nine and ten would require additional research and grant writing resources to accomplish and that we need to determine how to obtain them. D. Neidley suggested that specific people be identified to give more definition and determine how to assess the need for and sustainability of such a project. M. Murphy agreed citing the need to establish the kind of population and facility we are talking about. J. Freeman proposed forming small ad hoc groups to accomplish the tasks of clarifying where and how we start and what else we need to know. The question of use of the detention center was raised. M. Murphy responded about the efforts of its director to explore various use of the space and roadblock he has encountered around state, local and federal regulations. Members clarified that we are in fact talking about a central point of entry as a focus.

After additional discussion on community needs, use of CSA funds, connection with JCAC and the correlation of numbers nine and ten. An ad hoc group of B. Ferrier, J. Freeman, D. Neidley and B. Taibbi was formed to “spec” out the project. B. Ferrier expressed her hesitation as a “newcomer” and it was suggested that she speak to her colleagues at the CSU to determine if there was someone there who might be more interested/appropriate. S. Baker stated that the County will be allowing CCF to link to its grants locator resources and she would be watchful for grant opportunities to facilitate the process.

J. Freeman began the review of the charge to subcommittee acknowledging that additional discussion members need to collectively figure out a way to do them.

The Program Subcommittee is the lead committee to monitor the implementation of CSA services and identify needs for new resources.

Specifically:

- Recommend and develop early intervention, prevention, and initiatives, beginning with those identified in CCF’s CSA Cost Containment Report, November 2004;
- Identify service gaps and needed resources, and make recommendations for changes in programs and/or system policies and procedures as a result of the trend data (i.e. demographics,

cases, Harmony reports) from CSA partners and agency staffs to facilitate in the analysis of current and emerging patterns; (S. Baker stated that this item needed to be data driven and asked that C. Stratton explore what types of reports are currently available, how they can be access and how frequently. D. Neidley was requested to explore Harmony for the same type of information. They will report back at the next meeting. Members agreed that this process is in progress with the pursuit of the systems of care information. D. Neidley suggested that the next meeting of the subcommittee be used to identify existing methods of gathering data for the group.)

- Review, understand and communicate State Policy and CSA program changes to CSA partner agencies and staffs as appropriate and CSA program staffs as needed; (C. Stratton noted that she is in the process of requesting a meeting with the Chairs of the various committees to facilitate this and will update members as progress is made.)
- Monitor and evaluate “best practices” in order to identify and insure efficient and effective use of program resources and desired program outcomes. (S. Baker noted that the monitoring of best practices would require resources that are not currently available and would probably be assigned to an intern if available. M. Murphy noted that we should decide how to do this on a regular basis. B. Taibbi suggested that the FAPT could assist and forward information to the subcommittee. C. Stratton stated that the FAPT sees a small segment of what needs to be done and the net needs to be broadened. B. Ferrier suggested the Judges “best practices” group as a resource. Members had additional discussion about recommendation number 13 and judicial relationships and reasonable efforts, the state task force’s report on relinquishment of custody to obtain services, impact of legislative changes, need for updated information to judicial representatives and how to proceed. S. Sheffield noted that care should be taken to offer suggestions when requesting changes. B. Ferrier suggested getting on the “Best Practices” meeting agenda. C. Stratton noted that she has already begun a draft letter to Judges and will work with S. Baker on completion. An ad hoc group was formed to pursue a process for dialogue with the Judges. Members are B. Ferrier, C. Stratton, CDSS representative – D. Neidley to provide name and ACDSS representative – J. Freeman to provide name. C. Stratton will schedule a meeting of the ad hoc group once names are received. B. Ferrier noted that July 1st would be a good time to host a breakfast or dinner to facilitate the discussion due to the selection of the new Chief Judge. An agenda specifying the discussion, how and who will deliver will be developed.)

VI. Old Business/Updates

A. Work Plan/Pending Issues Priorities

There was a brief review and discussion of the pending issues list and its origin. Specifically, the tracking of early intervention services received considerable attention. Members noted the issue of confidentiality, access to school records, validity of historical information, cost associated with the project and inconsistency of information obtained and contained in the I.F.S.P. **It was agreed by consensus that although this was an issue worth developing, it is not on the top of its list of priorities, but will remain on the list for review as time and resources permit.**

B. Feedback on Federal DHH Grant RFP

Members had not had time to review the full grant proposal for feedback.

C. Summer Grant RFP – Plans – Discussion

There is currently no update on the RFP for the grant. B. Taibbi will check with CSB staff to get more information.

VII. New Business

A. Region Ten Representative Replacement – Deleted

B. Relationship Development Exploration with Region Ten

C. Legislative Meeting with Delegate Landes

S. Baker requested input from members on the upcoming meeting with Delegate Landes by a small contingency of CSA partners after a brief background summary. The review of juvenile justice youths going into foster care for services was mentioned. Members were requested to contact her or C. Stratton if they had any ideas for local community initiatives they felt were appropriate for consideration for presentation as solutions or cost containing options.

D. Use of Non-mandated Funds Update

J. Freeman distributed a letter from the OCS on these funds from Sept. 2004 which outlined the funding and relationship with the local FAPT's and CPMT's. C. Stratton noted that clarification is necessary since the letter states "These funds are to be used exclusively for children and adolescents not mandated for services under the Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) for At-Risk Youth who are identified and assessed through the Family Assessment and Planning Teams (FAPT) and approved by the local, Community Policy and Management Teams (CPMT) of the localities. DMHMRSAS provides these funds to the Community Services Boards (CSB) based upon an individualized plan of care methodology." The guidelines from DMHMRSAS states "3. Referral procedures for accessing services supported by funds will be communicated to key local agencies, such as juvenile detention centers, social services departments, and school divisions. The development of CSB capacity to provide periodic documentation to the Department or the CPMT regarding the source of referrals to services funded with these new dollars is recommended.

4. Local coordination exists between the CSB and the Family Assessment and Planning and Community Policy and Management Teams to ensure identification and assessment of children and adolescents who could be served with these funds and to develop protocols that reduce barriers to serving them. CSBs have the lead responsibility to develop these protocols.

B. Taibbi stated that he would get more detailed information on the amounts available and report back to the group. Information received at the previous meeting will be copies and forwarded to absent members.

VIII. **Review Meeting Objectives**

Members reviewed the meeting objectives and acknowledged that they had been successful in their work considering the time allowed.

IX. **Next Meeting Date**

The next meeting of the subcommittee is Wednesday, May 25, 2005, 2:30 – 4:30 p.m., CCF Conference Room.

X. **Adjournment**

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

- Members will review work plan priorities and progress.
- Members will identify additional resource/reference material request for staff.
- Members will establish next steps.