

Early Intervention Planning Council
October 10, 2007
Minutes

Members present:

Rhonda Allen
Christina Ball
John Brandon
Doris Clark
Lonnell Conley
Taren Duncan
Judge Marilyn Moores
Marilyn Pfisterer
Brant Ping

Members not present:

Patricia Jones
John Kennedy

Staff present:

Eric Wright
Tom Stucky
Laura Littlepage
Lyndy Kouns
Courtney Federspiel
Daniel Clendenning

The meeting was convened at 8:05 am.

Rhonda Allen: Prior to getting into the agenda, John Kennedy was not going to be here but he asked for Brant Ping to be his proxy for today's meeting and Brant has graciously agreed to serve in that capacity. Are there any other announcements with regards to fill-ins or anything like that?

Eric Wright: Not that we're aware of.

Lonnell Conley: Is Bart Brown supposed to be here this morning?

Eric Wright: Well, we were informed last night that he was appointed but I don't know that he was informed. That was the first I had heard about that. Has he been told he was appointed yet?

Lonnell Conley: Yes.

Eric Wright: We need to get his contact information. Were there any other appointments?

Lonnell Conley: No, not that I know of.

Rhonda Allen: Well, then let's move on to the approval of the minutes from the September meeting. Looks like there were very few folks here that day, including myself. I apologize for not being able to be present for that meeting. Any amendments, additions, corrections, questions, comments?

Laura Littlepage: Just that Rhonda wasn't present.

Rhonda Allen: Yes, I wasn't listed there.

Eric Wright: Add Rhonda to the members not present.

Rhonda Allen: If there are no corrections or amendments, then the minutes can stand as approved by this group unless there are objections. Minutes are approved. Item number 2, the draft report on analysis of child welfare funding sources. We're not giving that today?

Eric Wright: Not doing that today. Just to update you a little bit about what happened. On October 1st, which was our due date for the consultant, he walked into Laura's office and apologized but due to family illness and his own illness, he was unable to complete the project. He felt bad, but we had been getting regular updates and we thought everything was on track so when he walked in on the due date it was kind of a surprise to us, took us for a loop. We have since reorganized and I want to introduce Daniel Clendenning, who I know people have already started getting e-mails from, who is taking over that project. He is a full-time staff person at the Center and so he will be pinch hitting on that task. We did get what had been completed from him and started compiling that with what we had already collected so we're hopeful that we'll get something together by November. That's our target goal, which is not too far out in the distance future. So it won't be too far off the mark. If he calls, if you could do your best to work him in as quickly as possible that would be really helpful.

Rhonda Allen: What is Elizabeth Watkins doing with regards to funding?

Eric Wright: She is a graduate assistant for us so she's also helping Daniel. But she's only 10 hours a week but Daniel's full time on this for the next month.

Rhonda Allen: OK. Because Elizabeth has contacted me and our schedules have just not worked.

Eric Wright: Those are the two names that you'll see flying. They've kind of divided up the pieces. But some of the meetings we've had the early part of the summer with fiscal folks from DCS, he is falling up with those leads which we thought the consultant, at least he told us he was, but apparently not much happened there.

Rhonda Allen: Dr Wright, do you want to lead us to move on to item three, a discussion of long-term strategies for expanding funding for prevention and early intervention?

Eric Wright: If you remember from last fall, and we may want to postpone this a little bit until we have the fiscal analysis completed, but if you remember from last fall it was pretty clear as we went through the funding strategies two things are operating here. One, much of the county dollars are collected retroactively based on what of the prior year's budget was spent. So basically the tax rate follows, if you will, the spending from DCS and Juvenile Justice from the prior year. So in fact, in that sense the collection is retroactive or reactive to spending patterns, which is one of the challenges that we're dealing with. The other challenge is in fact most of the funding sources that are currently in the system that fund child welfare and juvenile justice are largely statutorily wired and have lots of constraints attached to them as well as the DOE budget when we get to education. So one of the conclusions we came to last fall, which was I think still going to be born out though we'll have a better understanding about what the amounts involved are hopefully by the November meeting, is that we don't have a lot of flexibility in terms of re-allocating dollars from one area to another to support prevention. That seems to be the conclusion that seems to be continuing. So the question would be, what other strategies do we want to consider. We had talked about during the beginning of the conversation perhaps finding other ways to raise revenue, whether that included user fees, perhaps new allocation of tax revenues, those kind of things and that was basically where we were so this was meant to follow the discussion fiscal as we learned that. But I think that's where we need to be thinking and perhaps if we can postpone that until the November meeting we'll have a little better sense of that. And know at least – I forgot Kent Burrow – Bart Brown is replacing Kent Burrow is one of the things I learned – but Kent particularly was the one that was advocating for understanding where the dollars were before we drew conclusions about that so I'm hoping with Bart's addition to the Council we'll have a similar conscious on our group to think about that kind of stuff. But I think once we have those numbers it'll be pretty clear, or clearer at least, what our constraints that we are going to be operating under are. So I'd be happy to talk about that more if people want to start discussions about that. You got in the packet of material, which you also got by e-mail, the overheads we presented to Rules & Policy last night and I just wanted to highlight one of the challenges, which is on page seven which relates to the fiscal issue. There's clearly an operating assumption in this area that, it's the second slide on page seven, that there is some sort of confusion in the conversations we've been having about what funding is available in child welfare and juvenile justice and how much of that we may actually draw from to actually fund prevention. That seems to be the logic, that people are hoping we'll be able to save more in juvenile justice and child welfare but I think we need to be really clear that, I think we've been really clear here but in the larger we've been not as clear, that basically to save that money in the long run we have to start investing it on the front end in terms of early intervention and prevention and that's where Professor Stucky and his work on the Crime Prevention task force with the Mayor, there's a new pot of money that's become available so start trying to coordinate our spending with that area would be really helpful. I just want to make sure that we're all clear here about that as we think through these long term strategies.

Lonnell Conley: Have you had a meeting with Councilor Boyd concerning this?

Eric Wright: Not since, other than last night, no. We've had one meeting about a week before that but I think we're trying to raise this to be sure everybody's clear about this. Because I think one of the questions is how much do we want to spend in the short term versus can we afford obviously given some of the constraints we're working under at the moment.

Rhonda Allen: Can I get clarification on what really the confusion is? I mean, what has it been nailed down to. It seems like that issue keeps coming up over and over again and there's this confusion about DCS funding and Juvenile Justice funding.

Eric Wright: I think there is a perception that in fact we could pull some money out of the juvenile justice and DCS systems and put it into our dish and right now I think we discuss when we did our initial look last fall, I think in DCS there is about \$200,000, prevention dollars, that could be perhaps allocated for that purpose but we didn't see a whole lot of wiggle room outside of that \$200,000 to do just that. And I think one of the things that as the conversations have been developing, the Mayor's office certainly made a commitment and I believe the Council supported, toward crime prevention and Professor Stucky and I started talking about this, a lot of the stuff on their list to fund or likely programs to fund were all the kinds of things that we're talking about funding as well. So one of the things I tried to emphasis last night, perhaps too quickly, but to pull those two discussions together because basically this provides an opportunity to use the same pot of money to do both. Because crime prevention is also early intervention and prevention, at least the way I think your group has conceptualized it and the way we've conceptualized it. So in that sense it's clearly a pot of money available that I think maybe we may not have been as aware of so trying to connect the conversations would be a way of actually having recourse that are available to the system.

Rhonda Allen: Are there any other questions around this decision item? It sounds like we're going to dive into it a little bit further with the expanding funding analysis.

Eric Wright: This should probably have been 'drafting' but we started the conversation last meeting and weren't able to complete it. One of the questions which Councilor Boyd and I talked about a couple of times is what's the long term vision of the EIPC and it's my understanding and Councilor Conley and Councilor Pfisterer if you wouldn't mind chiming in here, is this is basically conceived of as a permanent body that would basically have oversight responsibilities around prevention and early intervention needs in the long term. Our support staff role is dictated by a contract so one of the questions would be, what the Council wants to do in terms of the long term, assuming that our contract will run out next April and will not be renewed. How the Council would want to operate, so it's more of a questions that I think begs discussion to plan for that as part of the transition process. I don't know if the Councilors want to comment on that?

Marilyn Pfisterer: I don't have any comments.

Lonnell Conley: The only thing I thought, when you and Rozelle met, that one of the things we were discussing, he was going to give you some insight on that.

Eric Wright: OK. That hasn't happened yet.

Lonnell Conley: It's coming up.

Eric Wright: Is this premature? Should we wait until after that conversation?

Lonnell Conley: I kind of think you should.

Eric Wright: OK.

Rhonda Allen: Just for a point of clarification for me, if it looks like your contract is ending April of 2008, does it look like we're going to get through the majority of the things that we would need from you in a support role? Because you had been, I think your group has done a great job of really providing us with a lot of information and pointing us in the direction we need. I think this group has the capacity to move on based on what you have done for this group so I'm wondering if April '08, are we on track where you won't be providing as much of that support?

Eric Wright: I think we're on track. I think what worries me is that we will put some things in place that might require some perhaps lower level of staff support to make sure it's happening, but I think if we are successful in getting, for example the first plan of strategic planning organization, then that from the beginning I think Councilor Boyd said he thought that was the logical route, perhaps shepherd some of the strategic planning part of the process through and so that was sort of planning for our obsolescence. That's the way I saw it too. But I think the question was how do we institutionalize that role. And I do think that might be a smaller role for us in terms of technical assistance to that agency in the long term, particularly around the evaluation issues that might be helpful. But I can certainly talk to Councilor Boyd about that. But that's certainly the way I was planning, that was my vision at least. I think we'll get all the data stuff that we've gotten and we'll be more on track for having a plan and get it to the point where it's been voted on by the Council at that point and have a better sense of the role for us in the long term.

Rhonda Allen: OK, thank you. On to the draft plan component 1, nonprofit coordination.

Eric Wright: If you want to pull out two things, you have a lot of paper in front of you, I apologize for that – what you are looking at is the document Nonprofit Coordinating Agency Business Plan 10/3/07. If you remember the major goal for, as I reported to Rules & Policy last night, we are kind of operating, the plan will have 3 bit parts, each part will be conceptualized separately to go to the Council in pieces. I'm not sure if you want to wait to consider all three together, but we see each of these as having separate plans. So just to walk you through, what we tried to do is, if you remember in June we proposed originally that we would identify McCoy as the point, or agency, as the leading agency here and one of the feedbacks we got back from the Council over the summer was they

would prefer us to seek a more general approach were we actually would put this out for bid essentially to ask any type of agency that might want to take this role on in a more competitive process to come forward and then put together a proposal. So in an effort to that we've been developing a business plan. This is where it gets a little tricky because you don't want to tell an agency too much how to do its business, we're conceptualizing this business plan really as here are the operational principles that we want this agency to do and this is something that we would see an agency would do in addition to whatever else that they're doing. But the idea here would be, you remember, to identify an agency that would function with city and county sponsorship as the coordinating body of the nonprofit sector. Because there is no legal requirement for agencies doing business in Marion County to follow the rules of this, this is basically a strategic planning body, it would have to do consensus building, pulling people together, and coordinating that. Now one of the things that go through the plan, we can walk through it here, there are two major functions. One is strategic planning, if you remember over the last year we've had several conversations about how the nonprofit agencies, which is where the bulk of the work for prevention and early intervention, there's very little conversation happening among the agencies about what they're doing and where they're doing it and so one of the ideas was this agency could bring the players together to do coordinated strategic planning in an effort to hopefully reduce duplication of services, to fill in gaps where there are other areas that are not, and also secondly to help leverage outside dollars to improve intervention and prevention. That primarily would be a function we call a development function, so those are the two functions and the feedback we have received from the community has been such that we think this would actually fill a nice niche in the system because right now most of the agencies that are providing prevention and early intervention programs are relatively small, typically don't have a development officer and often work grant fund to grant and if we're going to actually build that system up we need both coordinated planning and also engage in development so the proposal originally, the budget, attached to this which John had proposed when we asked, were working under the assumption that this was going to be McCoy, was in fact a budget which basically had two individuals specified. One would essentially be the strategic planning function and another person who would be doing the development function. So that basically is kind of like hiring a development officer and a strategic planning officer for the system and then giving that responsibility to an agency. And so what we have tried to do here is to articulate this in a more in-depth fashion than was articulated in the June 14th proposal that Councilor Pfisterer actually took to the Council. So, any questions about the general, comment about the general philosophy? Hopefully this is not a surprise. We've talked about it before. Basically what this is is a more detailed plan of that June 14th. The one part that is not attached here, is still attached but we haven't talked about, is the budget and whether or not we want to do that since this is now going to be put out to bid. The second thing we need to talk about is whether or not we need to talk about how the review process might work and that's where I think we need to specifically consider this role. But, most of the front is pretty self-explanatory I think. We're just basically calling this the non-profit coordinating agency. The objectives to facilitate collaboration between youth serving agencies through strategic partnerships, sharing of information and services, and then here we have clear, specific objectives we want this agency to fulfill including or identifying and facilitating opportunities for joint

ventures, conducting research on best practices information, again building on the stuff that has already happened and will continue hopefully to be updated over the years, create a comprehensive report profiling early intervention services and programs available in Marion County. This we see as a piece of the puzzle of the EIPC because right now there's no single agency in the community that knows what's going on so when we went to look for data, for example, we went to all the major institutional players – courts, DCS – but to compile that system level information about what else is going on in the community there's no single point of contact so the goal would be of this coordinating issue is try to pull that information together kind of in an annual report of what's going on in the nonprofits side that could then be combined with reports from DCS and Juvenile Justice and major system players. This we kind of see as strategic system planning. Comments or questions about that particular directive?

Doris Clark: Am I to understand that for bid purposes the financial statement will be eliminated?

Eric Wright: Let's focus on this part but we want to talk about that specifically and what the sentiment of the group is, whether we should do that or not.

Doris Clark: OK.

Eric Wright: The second point on the strategic planning objective, we'll send this out to you electronically if you want to wordsmith and send us back feedback. Our goal would be to have something approved by this group by the next month's meeting and get it to Rules & Policy to consider. The second function which is related to the strategic planning, where the first one focuses on primarily the nonprofit sector, the second bullet is designed to connect the nonprofit sector more carefully with the current institutional players – DCS, mental health, juvenile justice, but here it's basically coordinate what's going on with the nonprofit. One of the major vehicles here will be this agency probably should serve as a standing representative to the EIPC. This is where I think the long term conversations would be happening. Basically this is the 2nd level of the strategic planning, coordinate what's going on, this is in fact where DSC, courts might say we need more of this and then this would be the go-to person and then would work with that particular agency to pull together the players to actually try to make some of these things happen. So those are the two strategic planning goals. The third bullet is basically coordinating resource development and this is actually technical assistance for grant writing. We have heard this over and over again as we've walked around the system from the small agencies that this is something they could use. The mayor's office apparently at one-point 5 or 6 years ago had identified somebody to help with this in the mayor's office because I worked with them a couple of times but that doesn't seem to be a stable thing. The city decides to go after certain pots of money and then it brings the players together. And the idea of this agency would be dedicated to have a dedicated individual to be working on nothing except development so bring the city players together, the county players, the institutional players and say we have an opportunity to go after, say child and family administration money in DC, let's go after that. It would help the agencies pull the team together, write the grant and get it out the door and move on to the next one. This is

basically a dedicated function. In theory, our hope would be, if this person – development officer – is worth their weight, they will eventually bring in enough money to the agency that this would be a self-sustaining thing. This is a normal model for nonprofit development officers, that if they're doing their job well then they should pay for themselves eventually. So this might be a case where the start up monies were basically also relieved in pressure down the road. But again, the idea would be knowing what the resources that are available are and accessing them. Our impression from, at least our review of the DCS/Juvenile Justice budgets, are doing a pretty good job of accessing most of the available funds, there might be a couple of pockets here or there we could do a better job of accessing. The biggest problem again is the opportunities that are missed because the nonprofit sector is not coordinating this activity and I think that is where we see the growth potential here. Not necessarily augmenting what is going on in the Juvenile Justice or DCS because most of those as I've said earlier are statutorily defined. And then basically the forth bullet is to lead the efforts basically as a community leader in this area. Any questions about the general goals? This is just more words to elaborate what we had talked about before so hopefully those are pretty clear. Now operationally, the goal here would be to identify a parent agency, they would then be asked to hire staff for that new agency, and then the new agency, could be existing agency there with a new function, and basically to communicate with youth serving agencies in the community – and by the way, the survey that we're conducting, we would hand them the list so they would have a database to start with, this is the nice thing about the way we've designed this – they would create awareness and would have to actually do a lot of community development activities and might want to add some other things about fulfill the functions above to develop mechanisms or strategies to fulfill that. One of the things would be how specific do we want to be in this regard? Are there things that we would want to ask this agency to do? We're basically writing a RFP here.

Brant Ping: Based on my RFP experience, I would suggest you put parameters in there because when you get an unknown product or several unknown products that they respond to, my experiences say the agencies prefer more guidance rather than less.

Eric Wright: So, what would you suggest be added? I mean, one thing could be that we take the bullets from above and translate those into expectations language. So, for example, we might say, under facilitate collaboration between youth, we could say establish mechanisms to promote collaboration or something like that effect and say, for example, joint meetings/planning meetings. A lot depends on how specific we want to be, but we could say these are the objectives and then translate those into activity areas.

Brant Ping: I think that would be fine. I wouldn't go beyond that to be honest.

Eric Wright: OK, alright.

Brant Ping: The objectives are really good.

Eric Wright: OK. Now, bugetarily, this is where we get back to your point, Doris. We looked in the budget from the original proposal from June, which again were based on

John's figures when we were going to start with McCoy as an applicant, but the question that would be here is do we want to actually specify an amount? I think this perhaps hits the Council here because we're going to have to figure out how much money. Do we want to have the agencies come in so we end up getting a situation where we look at the budget they're proposing and it's feasibility within that, do we want to give some parameters around that? One of the questions is how much do we need to invest. I think the nice thing about the budget we got from John was it kind of gives us an estimate of what we might want to expect from an agency. The question would be, would that be sufficient or do we want to give some more wiggle room to other applicants that might want to come in and perhaps do more or less? Do you have some thoughts on this Doris?

Doris Clark: The only thing I was thinking in terms of a RFP is that parameters are OK but in doing an evaluation of the agency I think it would be good to hear what their expectations are in terms of budget.

Eric Wright: OK. So leave it more open-ended.

Doris Clark: Yes.

Eric Wright: Do we want to say there's a cap and we would not consider applications above a certain figure?

Brant Ping: No. If you suggest a figure, all your agencies will go to that figure.

Doris Clark: That's exactly right.

Brant Ping: At the same time, if you cap it too low, you'll have a number of agencies that will say we can't do it for this so they won't respond. We have issued them and rejected all of the proposals because we screwed up in the way we wrote it or we just weren't happy with what came back.

Lonnell Conley: Was there something specific allotted?

Eric Wright: No. There's no source of funding so that's one of the variables that we don't understand.

Marilyn Moores: That's going to take Council items. What I would suggest is offering several options of things the Council could consider. Here's high end, here's medium, and here's bare bones so that they can look because that's the only way it's going to get funded and you guys want choices, don't you? But you want informed choices. I mean they need to be able to say, OK here is what we would get for this, here's the capabilities at this level and then they would be able to say this is a bit rich but this is something we could look at. Funders need to make that decision, not the folks that are designing it. We can present them with a model but ultimately they write the checks.

Marilyn Pfisterer: That's what a request for a proposal is all about, is providing that model so responders can review and see if it's something they can comply with or

participate in and as there isn't a source of funding I don't see this as being implemented until 2009, which would involve a 2008 budget cycle and so there would be time enough to review the proposals, work it into the budget if there is such a decision to be made that this is a proposal that's to be accepted for bid in the budget cycle.

Eric Wright: That makes sense. I think one question which I still don't fully understand is how is the Council and the Mayor working with the new crime prevention dollars that have come available because one of the logical discussions that we've had, between the two of us at least, is that this actually could be a part of that function.

Marilyn Pfisterer: That's from the Justice agency as I understand it.

Lonnell Conley: It's going to be an efficiency commission that will determine how those dollars are allocated. So you submit your proposal.

Eric Wright: So this might be considered a piece of that.

Lonnell Conley: It could easily be.

Eric Wright: OK.

Marilyn Moores: They have different models of, levels of which things would be funded because she's right. It would have to be in the '08 discussion for funding in '09.

Eric Wright: OK. So we would write this with no requirements other than that and have an attachment perhaps that would say here's what we would probably expect an agency to come with. A Volkswagen version and then the Cadillac version, which would give a sense about a range that might require.

Laura Littlepage: We'd give that to the agencies?

Eric Wright: I don't think we can give that to the agencies.

Laura Littlepage: But that's for the Council.

Eric Wright: This would be stuff for the Council.

Laura Littlepage: I was going to say, you don't want to give that, you'll get all Cadillac's.

Lonnell Conley: That's true. Or Lamborghinis.

Eric Wright: We'll focus on Cadillac's. So we can work on that so we'll continue to flush this out. Are there other reactions to this general idea? We'll take the money piece out and say propose your budget and that's how we'll phrase it and we'll have this attachment with what we think will be the expected range of costs in terms of how an agency might look at this, because that could be easily done, I think.

Marilyn Pfisterer: It wouldn't be just the costs when you are doing a request for proposals. You're doing not only what it's going to cost but what they bring to the table, am I correct?

Eric Wright: Yes, you mean in-kind contributions?

Marilyn Pfisterer: No, not in-kind but their qualifications. What they are willing to provide toward the budget that they're requesting.

Eric Wright: Yes. There's clearly a business plan of their own, how they would operate and all the specifics. We can add that.

Marilyn Pfisterer: I wanted to make sure that was in.

Eric Wright: That's good. Are there other things that you want to see in this document?

Rhonda Allen: This is going to serve basically as a RFP?

Eric Wright: I think so, yes. I think the way we'll present it to the Council is, at least initially, is as a proposal, as the framework. And then if they choose to adopt this then we'll help them with the RFP language. I'm sure the city attorneys would get involved at that point. Unless there's other comments, I think we're done with that agenda item.

Laura Littlepage: Do we still want to send them a copy electronically?

Eric Wright: What I propose is we'll take another crack at it based on the verbal feedback we got and then you can take a crack at that one. Unless you see the need to do it two steps, I figure one step is better.

Rhonda Allen: We're at item six then.

Eric Wright: Yes we are. This is basically a discussion again that we started last meeting to begin the process of articulating the views of the EIPC. As you may remember, one of the challenges is there is a separation between who is spending the child welfare dollars. It's basically the state spends the child welfare dollars, the county collects the child welfare dollars. There has been some discussion about trying to sort through some of the issues and whether or not we want to advocate for a particular position. There has been some discussion both at the state level and at the county level about consolidating this authority into either at the local level or at the state level. I've been asked to explore this with the EIPC and where this group comes down. One of the arguments for consolidating it at either level is that it would allow perhaps more flexibility with regard to spending money on early intervention and prevention and better coordination of what's going on in juvenile justice – child welfare with early intervention and prevention activities. In other words, thinking about this as a continuum. So one of the questions we've been asked is what kind of guidance do we want to give to the community about where the EIPC would

recommend how this proceeds. It's a question. We didn't have a quorum last time to talk about this.

Marilyn Moores: One of the concerns I would have with that issue is, for example Rhonda's agency is very clear. Rhonda's and Taren's agency, has a clear position on that and I don't know if the Council does but I know certainly the Mayor does. And I have my own opinion and I'm sure other folks in this room do, but to ask people to perhaps vote on a position that may be contrary to their agency may be problematic. Does that make sense?

Eric Wright: I just said I would raise it.

Marilyn Moores: It's going to be a hot topic and it's going to be a hot topic at the legislature and I imagine it's going to be a knock down drag out, teethnashing, hair pulling kind. Of course when you think about, about everything we go through is. But because it's part in parcel with property tax reform which is under discussion now, I think we place some of our membership in difficult positions.

Eric Wright: Fair enough.

Rhonda Allen: I appreciate your comments. I was wondering how I was going to formulate a response to this and be politically correct, so thank you Judge.

Marilyn Moores: Believe me, I'd love to take a position on it, but it wouldn't be necessarily a popular one.

Rhonda Allen: Is there any way you can clarify the language, just when you said state spends, county leverages? To me, that doesn't ring as 100% true. Because that's what I hear consistently, is the state spends/county leverages the money but I guess there are state employees involved in this process and I don't necessarily equate that as the state spending the county money because I would say 85-90% of the budget that we spend gets approved by the juvenile court. So is not a situation where the state is spending the money without any kind of county oversight because the juvenile court is that oversight. And in addition to that, probably 40% of the \$103 million we have in our budget for next year is going to be dedicated to juvenile justice issues and those are county employees so I guess just for clarification sake, sometimes when I hear state spends/county leverages, it doesn't feel accurate to me.

Eric Wright: I think just looking at the flow of dollars that's a very accurate statement in itself. I think there's a lot of blur but I think where there gets some tension is the concept of home rule and to what extent does the county have responsibility to do a lot of functions that the state is assuming versus the state going to apply that across the state. There are strengths and weaknesses to both models going in either direction and right now you are absolutely right, it's a blurred system and I think that's the confusion. The question is, who's in charge.

Marilyn Moores: Well one thing we could do and one of the things that I think is not necessarily being discussed at a level and with the players that we have here, is just the true considerations on either side. It's such an emotional issue when you say property tax and people just stop listening and start screaming. And that's sort of what I did when I got my bill so I identify with them. But I think that the EIPC might be very well configured to discuss some of the nuances. As Rhonda said, it isn't just the state spends and the county levies. It isn't that simple. There are a lot of folks that are very concerned about loss of local control and keeping children close to home and having care providers that are local and not elsewhere. One of my hardest concerns is the state doesn't pay very quickly. It's not that they sit around and hold stuff, it's that the bigger government is, the slower it seems to move. And while that may be at least tolerable for some of our service providers who are not-for-profits of long standing and who have endowments, for a lot of our smaller services providers who tend to be our minority service providers and with emphasis on cultural competence in services for kids, I'm absolutely terrified about what a long wait does to somebody who doesn't have an endowment and has to live on cash flow. And these are very valuable service providers and I think that maybe that is a discussion we could have and put together a more thoughtful, not position paper, but consideration paper for something to say to those that are deciding – have you thought about this, have you considered what this does because right now, from what I see, they're only hitting the highlights and there's a lot more rhetoric and a lot less...

Brant Ping: Understanding.

Eric Wright: I think that's a point well taken and I was actually going to try to suggest we move in that direction but you sort of beat me to the punch, because I think one of the things in the oversimplification of the debate I think one of the things that we could do is what do we as the EIPC think should be used for consideration, I would say principles. If we're going to think about reforming this, and may it's easy to say its state or local, but I think there are some things that both levels of the government bring to the table. One thing to add to Judge Moores point is the state actually applies a consistency across counties, that an absolute home rule might create some inequities across counties and differences. There are also clear differences between counties like Marion and Lake that actually have infrastructure at the county level whereas you go to Switzerland or Vanderburgh the infrastructure is very different. So the one thing the state brings to the table is clearly the ability to think about that and the consistency across. So perhaps we could make a laundry list, because I've been asked this a couple of times and I would like to be able to speak for the EIPC. So one is not simply the funding structure and realize that both the state and county bring funds to the table. Another point, Judge Moores point about slow pay, the state being basically slow to pay their bills which puts local providers particularly smaller minority providers at risk – having been on a couple of boards, I'm acutely aware of that one – and then the third one would be the need for consistency across counties.

Marilyn Moores: Well, and there's another consideration and that is, and we don't yet know what models are being talked about, but right now the family and children's fund which is levied at the county level provides the funding for all services for children

throughout the Department of Child Services for a CHINS mechanism, foster care, treatment for parents, therapeutic foster care, substance abuse, work all those sorts of things, but it also pays for services to juveniles in the delinquency model and it pays for everything except for if a child is sent to the Department of Corrections. Which as I understand it is out of county general. And the other problem that I am very very concerned about in this discussion is if the state takes over funding one of the more proffered models out there is that the state would take over funding for child welfare cases, if you will, and not services for delinquencies. And those kids are the same kids. Statistically, absolutely, unequivocally, these are the same kids. Anyone involved in that system knows that they're the same kids but, and there's a 30+% overlap between CHINS and JD kids, if that funding is separated and the county is responsible for the funding for delinquency while the state then takes over child welfare, I foresee an ultimate collision, initially everybody will have enough to feel comfortable but these are services that are rising at a rate of about 5-6% a year, which is why I can't imagine why the state wants to take it over, but if they separate those, once everybody starts butting up against their end of the funding you are going to have finger pointing. It is inevitable where DCS case managers are going to be pressured to say that is a delinquent, let the county pay for them and vice versa. And that is not a good model for child welfare, is not an accurate view of who these kids are, and I think that we are very blessed to have this conjoined funding because it recognizes that these kids are the same kids and there is a lot of rhetoric over at the statehouse right now among certain groups to say "Oh, those poor CHINS'd kids and these are the rotten delinquents." Well, it's not that simple and I think it's a very dangerous discussion and I think it puts a lot of kids at risk for ultimately being in that finger pointing battle. It's just inevitable that that's going to occur.

Eric Wright: So if we were to summarize the principle there, you see a great deal of strength in the blending of fundings?

Marilyn Moores: Oh, absolutely.

Eric Wright: So if I can offer another thought you might want to expand that even a little bit, right now we pay a lot of money for CHINS and juvenile delinquents but we're not really collecting any money or coordinating any services for youth that we would consider at risk. Remember, our epi-estimates, I mentioned this last night, we're estimating thirty-eight thousand kids in Marion County have at least four of CDC's high risk factors for becoming juvenile delinquents of CHINS cases. We know that there's only twelve thousand kids in the system right now. That was the last Star last estimate, which basically means about two-third's of those kids basically potential new, which is probably what's happening with the 5-6% drive - it's the tip of the iceberg. So if we're really going to get a handle on the 5-6% increase, we need to expand the conversation to think about how we're going to pay more for at risk kids to keep them from getting CHINS'd or juvenile justice. I guess the question would be if we take the principle of blended funding, how would we do that to serve the kids?

Tom Stucky: Listening to you talk about the funding issues, it strikes me that the more basic principle here is that the model that we've been working off of suggests that they're

not different groups of people and they're all in need of a variety of different types of services that up to this point have not been coordinated.

Marilyn Moores: Correct.

Tom Stucky: And so rather than thinking initially about the funding, is about what do these kids need and what should we provide for these kids regardless of whether it comes from DCS or juvenile system. The larger point is that they should be served whether we're talking about from one pot of money or another if the larger goal of getting these kids the services they need is the principle and we start with that, then it becomes a question of what's the best way either using a current structure or some future structure that keeps this larger goal in mind. It seems to me that might be a way of maybe defusing a little of the budget issue. I don't know that it would necessarily but I think it would get people to buy into the idea that keeping the two separate, hearing you talk about how there are people that are saying that these kids are needy kids, that don't blame and these kids are the kids that we blame strikes me as really problematic when you talk about thinking about this from bigger, long term development model that we've been working from. And I think really, frankly, is very accurate, that it's not reasonable to think of them as different groups.

Marilyn Moores: And the current funding recognizes that they're not different and applies to both and I'm just very very concerned about the potential separation because the kids that will lose will be the kids that are the most troubled and it's just nature's way of separating it.

Eric Wright: Is there a way we could strengthen the current system? If we're going to preserve the blended part, what would we do to recommend strengthening it?

Marilyn Moores: We're doing it. EIPC. It takes getting all the players, in my opinion, from the county fiscal body, from the trained thinkers, from DCS, from the schools, from probation, from the court. All of those different entities, that's the whole purpose behind the EIPC and it's what the federal statute requires, is to have a broad community based entity that looks at how to do that and then to have a plan. I think right now, the counties are objecting because I constantly hear "you're writing checks out of our checkbook without us being there." I think that a part of this discussion is very very dangerous is this isn't going to be a savings to the tax payer. This is ridiculous. This stuff has to be paid for and is paid for. One of the models is where the state will simply take over the property tax levy. That is not property tax relief. That's not happening. Another model is that the state would quit giving back the gazillion dollars in property tax homestead credits and then they would have the money to make the payments. I say again, that is not property tax relief for homeowners, unless and until they restructure completely the system, not the property taxing. I think that's got a lot of people over there working on that but I think this gets sold to local tax payers as this property tax relief meaning you're going to be a break. No, it just means to local entities, they can point the finger at the state. It doesn't mean that the person who is paying the bill is getting a break and I think that is

very much lost in the discussion. People think it's going to change and that their property taxes are going to go down and that's not true.

Eric Wright: So recognizing that we pay for the services, are there other things we want to push forward, things to think about in terms of improving the way things operate now? I think one of the questions that has been in my mind is, how much authority does this body have to bring the players together? It's not altogether clear. We're empowered by the Council but even the ordinance isn't very clear about what our policy making authority scope is, which might be something we want to think about because if we're going to think of this as a system of care, we talked about that concept before, then this becomes the coordinating body for that system of care.

Marilyn Moores: The ordinance really is irrelevant. The state statute that still exists says that this body is to develop the plan and that the court when looking at how to treat kids will order things in conjunction with this plan and utilize this. I don't have the statute directly in front of me but only about, somebody told me, one-half of the counties do this right now. Now that DCS has been regionalized, which makes sense in some of the smaller counties where – we're very resource rich, we are very blessed in that regard, we have lots of choices and folks to deal with – but that is not true in Steuben County or somewhere where if you can band three or four or five counties you have a better panoply of things to offer.

Lonnell Conley: What Judge Moores is saying is we don't have a major plan and that's where we need to zero in on and that's been the problem because I think we've been footing a lot of the bills the states been dictating so we need a plan. We need a major plan.

John Brandon: Again, it gets back to the whole reason for intervention and prevention because if we're only going to deal in symptoms we're not going to get a root cause of this then we're going to continue to have the 5-6% growth per year in the number of young people that have to be served until as we look at the, say we have 38 thousand young people with four of the CDC risk factors perhaps one of our things as a community is we need to be looking at how do we reduce those risk factors because as long as those risk factors exist we're going to continue to have young people who are going to require those costly services which our property tax dollars are paying for. Wouldn't it make more sense for us to invest those dollars, and I know we get into that 'how do we direct dollars statutorically', how can we direct those dollars into those prevention/intervention services for those young people and for the families from which they spring?

Eric Wright: Given that, I think we are clearly moving in that direction in the three parts that we have. I guess one thing that would be, we should give this some thought over the next couple of weeks, is are there other things that we should be pushing for, other parts of the plan that we haven't perhaps considered to make it a bigger plan that would have more teeth to it. I think we've clearly identified three of the major places where we need something in place. A question would be is if there's other things that we need to add to that array of things? So that's a thought question, a rhetorical question. Are there any

thoughts you would like me to share with those who ask me, about this issue in the next couple of weeks? Because I know I'm going to get asked about this a lot.

Brant Ping: What are they asking you?

Eric Wright: The whole issue is reform and what do we do. I guess I would like to make sure when asked I'm reflecting the sentiments of the EIPC because I do think statutorily when you look at the ordinance of the state, clearly everybody is starting to look to the EIPC as the coordinating body so I think it'd be good to begin to reflect that philosophy and if we could figure out, identify a short list of things that we would want to do to make the system more efficient, in reform. It sounds to me like because of the property tax issue and it's close connection to all the child welfare and juvenile justice there's a collision course happening here, something's going to happen and it'd be nice for us to say here's the principles to keep in mind. Perhaps I should follow up with each of you individually and I can put some sort of document together that would actually reflect the thinking, and again, not necessarily taking a position per say but as we go through this reform process but here are some critical elements that might move us closer to a system of care that's more coordinated and efficient. Because right now I think there's some questions about whether it's an efficient structure and all the things we should do to increase the efficiency and perhaps you'd have some ideas that we can talk about and that I can put in a document.

Rhonda Allen. Thank you. We are at other business now.

Eric Wright: I would just call your attention to the document which you also received as an e-mail, our working operational plan. We are more or less on track still. This is basically what I see happening into the spring next year and barring any major setbacks, I think we are on the mark more or less. You'll probably get a lot more e-mails in the next few weeks to look at documents so I would ask to keep us on track since we're trying to move this process along as fast as possible that you would at least let us know that you've looked at them and you approved them or if you want to take some time to edit, send them back as soon as you can so that we can get some work done between the meetings a little more to move the developmental plans forward. If you have any thoughts or comments about that, that is our work plan and what's going to happen in each agenda meeting in the month and then the staff task which we'll be working on so things will be coming at you very quickly. The last item, you have the current versions of the two surveys. There's an agency version which is the shorter one, which the way this is shaping up is much like interagency surveys are done, there's often two parts, one that goes to the agency CEO-type and then the second longer version will go to the program heads. The goal here is because some agencies operate multiple programs so we'll get large budgetary information about where they're getting their money and information that will be critical for the development group to get and then here we're actually asking them to catalog the services they're providing so we can actually start to populate our theoretical continuum of care so we can identify gaps and so forth. So I would ask that you take half an hour, an hour, if you look through these and send us feedback because our goal, assuming I talk to Councilor Boyd to make the OK to proceed, our goal would

be to actually field this survey in November. So probably I'll be walking a hand written letter to get Judge Moore's and Rhonda's signature on the cover letter that we would include to go to the agencies to help move this process along so that everybody is appreciative of that. If that's OK with you, then I have no more business.

Rhonda Allen: Does anybody else have any other business?

Brant Ping: Will you have a Councilors' signature for that letter?

Eric Wright: I was actually going to ask the Councilors' from the EIPC.

Lonnell Conley: Be happy to.

Rhonda Allen: Thank you. We're adjourned.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 am.