

Family First- Fiscal and Revenue Enhancement Workgroup

Meeting Dates: January 8 & 14*, 2020

Summary of Information Shared

Co-chairs

Cindy Butterfield, DCF

Allison Blake, Child & Family Agency of Southeastern Connecticut

Welcome

- Cindy facilitated a roll call to open the meeting. There were several individuals participating from the larger external stakeholder community. While 100 lines were reserved for the call, several individuals reported via email that the call was at capacity and therefore were excluded from the benefit of the verbal exchange of information.
- Cindy reminded the group they are in effect “on hold” until the Candidacy Workgroup presents a draft candidacy definition recommendation.

Timelines & Scope of the Plan

- Cindy shared that the provider network felt that the accelerated timeline appeared that DCF has already come up with a plan. DCF has no plan, but needs to have an aggressive timeline in order to start Family First in October 2020. Connecticut needs to have its work done by end of April so the Governor’s Office can review the proposed plan in May, with hopes of federal submission by June to achieve the October 2020 implementation. It is anticipated the Children’s Bureau may have feedback regarding the submitted plan, so we are anticipating roughly 60 days of comments and resubmissions, leading up to plan approval, which explains the need for the extra two months at the end of the planning cycle.

Candidacy Workgroup Update

- JoShonda Guerrier provided an update of the efforts of the Candidacy Workgroup. The group meets weekly and recently voted to extend their meeting time from two to three hours.
- The group has been looking at entry points into our system, how people come to the attention of DCF, as well as Voluntary Services. The group will be further discussing juvenile justice involved youth and other entry points of where children and families may enter our system. The point is to assess the various population of individuals that could potentially be included in the candidacy definition.
- The Candidacy workgroup spent a half-day looking at data and having various presentations that included: Considered Removal; Family Assessment Response (FAR); Fred North (DCF) talked about Disproportionality Data, Re-entry Data, Careline Calls (Accepted vs. Non-accepted); and looking at Permanency. This process helped to start bucketing people who the group preliminarily thinks could definitely be a candidate for Family First, versus possibly being a candidate, versus falling into the broader 5-year prevention plan conversation.
- The last two Candidacy meetings have been spent wading through more defined conversations specific to the candidacy definitions based on the refined data analysis exercise. The Candidacy workgroup is moving closer to an agreement. Friday (Jan 24) the workgroup will discuss three (3) additional populations, with the anticipation of having a draft or actual definition for the Governance team on January 27.
- Phase 2 work will be the broader look at Prevention that goes beyond Family First. We want to figure out how to serve families that do not come to the attention of DCF.

**Due to technical difficulties experienced during the original convening on January 8, a make-up call was conducted on January 14. There was one individual present during this call.*

Program Workgroup Update

- During the most recent meeting (Jan 9) Dr. Cannata and Elizabeth Duryea spent time walking through the continuum of Evidence Based Practices in Connecticut. The two attempted to group the information into the three specific Family First buckets:
 - In-Home Supports;
 - Substance Issues and
 - Mental Health.

From this inventory, the co-chairs of the Programs and Service Array Workgroup realized there are “gaps” within the system. They began noting things that they will need to go back to in order to fill these identified gaps.

- A mapping exercise was done to identify who is missing in terms of evaluating which services sit in other systems of care not just limited to child welfare and behavioral health. Additionally, they began to ask, “Who else does this group need to talk to?” Some of the entities identified included schools and services through Court Support Services Division (CSSD).
- The group (Program and Service Array) is attempting to get a baseline in terms of what is currently known, so that when the Candidacy group provides a definition, they can begin to identify services to map to the target populations. Phase 2 of this group’s work will be to meet the needs of the broader prevention population.

Fiscal and Revenue Enhancement Charter

- Cindy shared Chapin Hall has been involved in this process and have been instrumental especially in drafting the Workgroup’s proposed Charter.
- Cindy will be sending out a draft of the charter to members of this workgroup.
- Cindy discussed how Miranda (Chapin Hall) assisted her in remaining focused when she began thinking about how to implement the “Scope of the Plan.” The advice given was to simply “GET THE PLAN DONE” and do not worry about implementation at this point.
- Charter Goals were reviewed. Cindy stated that the first three goals are a part of the bigger charter of the Governance Team. These are considered to be overarching goals of the whole report.
- The remaining goals are more specific to Fiscal and Revenue. The Maintenance of Effort (MOE) budget from the FFY 2014 Designated Point in Time is basically the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) expenditures. Cindy stated that she’s attempting to understand what is meant by TANF expenditures, especially since DCF along with DSS, DHMAS and DSS contributes to the overall TANF expenditures. A concern shared by Cindy was the fact that a big part of the TANF claim is the DCF Social Workers salaries. What will happen as the case loads get smaller and the number of Social Workers at DCF get smaller? Will DCF be able to meet what was spent on 2014 TANF services? Cindy stated that she will need to get to the bottom of what the MOE will be in regards to this issue. Another issue deals with TANF claim expenses sent to Department of Social Services (DSS) and whether or not DCF reached their cap in 2014.
- Cindy shared the reason for using the FFY 2014. Legislation was first written in 2015 and the last full fiscal year when they wrote this legislation was 2014. Legislation sat for a while and was not updated.
- In regards to the next two goals, Creating Financial Model and Developing a Scope and Budget, the following steps will occur. Once the Fiscal and Revenue get the Candidacy final grouping:
 1. The group will look at the population and pair that with Programs and Services;
 2. Try to match what the program is to Candidacy group;

3. Determine quantity and
 4. Implement from a financial prospective and what we can expect for revenue.
- We anticipate that we will lose revenue on some items that we now claim, but will pick revenue up on this end of the spectrum.

Other Considerations

- Family First must be the payer of last resort.
- In-home services have not been covered by Title IV-E in the past; this is not new ground or discovery for us.
- Despite 2014 being the baseline year, we will continue to spend more than we spent in 2014.
- Regarding TANF, DCF expenditures are embedded in TANF claims
 - It's a state effort; not just an agency requirement
 - \$110M cap under TANF, we have been offered \$120M in services
 - Some things from Office of Early Childhood have been taken off the TANF Claim
 - We don't find out until after a few quarters what was actually claimed.
 - The following programs are included in the TANF claim:
 - Case Management – In Home Services
 - Case Management – Out of Home Services
 - Early Childhood Development
 - Extended Day Treatment
 - Family Preservation – In Home Services
 - Family Preservation – Out of Home Services – PRIOR LAW
 - Investigation Services
 - Community Support for Families
 - Treatment/Prevention Child Abuse
 - Therapeutic Child Care
 - Parenting Support Program/Services (formerly Triple P)
 - Care Coordination
 - IPV Intimate Partner Violence
 - Emergency Mobile Psychiatric Services EMPS
 - Multidimensional Family Therapy MDFT
 - Case Management Administration
 - Investigations Administration
- When asked about the Family First Transitional Funds, Cindy replied, "Yes, I see the planning of the \$3M as a part of this group's scope."

Deliverables/ Key Tasks

- Currently working on getting the MOE ready.
- Developing Financial Models based on the proposed Candidacy population to assist the Governance team to determine the scope of this work. This means doing the financial models we talked about earlier.
- Apply the outcomes from the Program workgroup to the proposed Candidacy pool; matching up those two groups to see what they look like.
- Using data to drive highest need.
 - How many already served;
 - How many new participants?
- Determining a financial plan to implement the program expansion/shift. If this results in a budget expansion, we will need to get ready for the budget cycle that will occur in July and get the budget options in for September to be able to support this.

- Working with Stakeholders to determine the revenue enhancement impact and options for new revenue.
 - We have several vehicles for revenue enhancement (e.g. TANF, PMI, Medicaid, and Title IV-E).
 - We're looking at the options that will be part of the Candidacy pool.
 - We're looking for the best fit.
- Mike Gilbert, Deputy Commissioner of DSS, is on our committee and will be helpful in this process.
- Buy-in from the Legislature is needed; they have given us favorable support in many of our current programming.

Questions/New Items – Preparation for the next meeting

- DCF will be determining the MOE.
- This group will continue to review minutes from other workgroups.
- Website link will be sent out and added to future meeting invites.
- Phone call/Webinar vs. face-to-face meeting was discussed. It was determined that until information was received from the Candidacy and Program groups, information for the Fiscal and Revenue Enhancement workgroup would be disseminated via phone call or webinar.
- Information will be shared Ad Hoc via email.

Post Call Update

- Cindy shared the following communication with the group:

We have decided to cancel the Fiscal and Revenue Enhancement Workgroup meeting that is scheduled for 1/22/20. The other Workgroups are working to pull together their deliverables. We believe by our next scheduled meeting date we will have updates and the information we need to start on our part of the plan.

DCF is working on developing our Maintenance of Effort (MOE) calculation from 2014, which is our minimal level for prevention spending for this plan. We don't believe the outcome of that calculation will have a major impact on our plan overall but it is a step in the process we need to accomplish.

At our last meeting members asked why the federal legislation designates 2014 as the base year for calculating the MOE. DCF did contact our federal partners and they believe that year was selected because the bill was originally drafted in 2015, and 2014 was the last completed year of spending at that time. It appears that wasn't changed when the bill finally went to a vote years later.

Thank you for your interest and participation in this process.