

Early Intervention Planning Council  
June 11, 2008  
Minutes

**Members present:**

Rhonda Allen  
John Brandon  
Taren Duncan  
Patricia Jones  
Marilyn Pfisterer  
Brant Ping  
John Kennedy

**Members not present:**

Doris Clark  
Judge Moores  
Christina Ball

**Staff present:**

Laura Littlepage  
Tom Stucky  
Lyndy Kouns  
Daniel Clendenning

Rhonda Allen: We'll go ahead and get started this morning. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes from the April meeting. I don't know about the rest of the group but I wasn't able to pull them up and read them in advance.

Laura Littlepage: Oh, they were in a .exe file. I forgot to save them in a regular .doc. I'm sorry. I forgot you don't have the new word.

Rhonda Allen: Does anybody have any amendments or corrections that are noticeable they'd like to make? If no objections then we will go ahead and approve the minutes of the April meeting as is.

Laura Littlepage: If you want to move to update on surveys, that way we can leave a little time in case people come.

Rhonda Allen: OK, let's do that. Are you giving us that update, Laura?

Laura Littlepage: I believe Tom is going to do that.

Rhonda Allen: Tom?

Tom Stucky: I'll be doing that this morning. We are, as you know, fielding a two stage survey, starting with the agencies and then the programs within those agencies. In terms of agency survey, which is the first step, we have 70 of those agencies that have completed and the number of agencies that ideally we would like to have gotten is approximately 120. The number of agencies that is a possible number is probably going to go down some and most of the ones that remain are very small or are questionable as to what extent they actually provide services to youth. So, we feel pretty good that we've got the bulk of the agencies that are really doing the heavy lifting here in Marion County. What we're finding is that once we get in the door with agency that the program level survey completion is much more complete. So, we actually have about 300 programs that we'll be surveying and we've got a little over half of those finished. About 160 of those are finished. We are looking to wrap up in fairly short order the agency surveys. Unfortunately, the reality is that you're never going to get a complete response and we're finding more and more that there are a number of surveys that were fielded ahead of us. So people will only, people will answer the same questions over and over again. We're at a point where we feel like we are going to start analyzing data here fairly shortly and once we get to a point where we've decided we're going to cut off the agency data collection we'll be able to get some numbers to you in fairly short order in terms of at least some basic information. So, we're hoping, I don't want to guarantee by the next meeting, but we're certainly hopeful by the next meeting we should have some preliminary results from the agency side and then the program level is going to take a little bit more time. And obviously we have another 150 programs to survey, it's going to take a little while to get to that point. We're in pretty good shape at this point. And again, the really encouraging thing is that once we get a response from agencies it seems like we're getting nearly a 100% response at the program level so we'll have some pretty detailed information.

Rhonda Allen: Great. Anyone have any questions?

Brant Ping: I have a question. Tom, is it possible – you mentioned that the agencies have already been surveyed – is it possible to tie into those prior surveys to cross reference or add to your database?

Tom Stucky: I don't know that we've really explored that option.

Laura Littlepage: It wasn't by us. There has been a survey by United Way, I can't remember some of the other people they listed but other organizations so I don't know if they would want to share their data with us or not.

Tom Stucky: We certainly could take a look at that. And that's something we should probably have at least a couple of conversations about so I'll follow up on that.

Brant Ping: Well, if it's United Way, I think probably we could help with that agency as far as arranging a share agreement or something.

Laura Littlepage: I know Urban League, when I talked to Joe Slash Survey he had like four waiting from different places and he said I'll get to yours when I can. I guess its survey season.

Rhonda Allen: Any other questions? Great, thank you Tom.

Laura Littlepage: And in case anyone hasn't noticed, I'm not Eric. He's stuck in DC. I'm filling in today, so be nice. Hopefully, was everyone able to open the plan? That's the important one. There were a few things that we wanted to talk about, about the plan. First, did anybody have any general comments before we go into specifics or anything they wanted to comment on? One thing Eric wanted us to make sure and look at was the budget ranges for each of the pieces to see if they were reasonable. It's Appendix C, starting on page 36, so the first one is the Coordinating Agency budget and that is something we had talked about previously and had numbers for. The other ones, the Professional Support staff, the distribution of materials, the Mental Health and the Case Management – those are all new numbers. If we could take them one by one and see if they seem reasonable or if anyone has comments? Daniel would you like to talk about how you came up with the numbers, maybe that'll help? Just the reasoning?

Daniel Clendenning: The Coordinating Agency budget existed already. I just looked at that and updated some of the numbers a little bit. Across all of the budgets basically what I did was look at the goals that there were for each agency and what they were meant to accomplish and then I tried to structure the budget around those goals. For salaries, I used the BLS website and you can get average salaries plus you can get a percentage of standard deviation basically for the salaries and I used those specific numbers for Indiana. You can get it down to Marion County, but in Marion County a lot of jobs have some disclosure problems, there's just not enough data so I used the Indiana numbers. And some of these we ran by NACS. We met with NACS and showed them our early intervention case management program and had them review that because it's similar to some work that they do so we got some input from them as well.

Laura Littlepage: And they gave us some additional expenses that we hadn't thought about like mileage, which is a big one especially now.

Daniel Clendenning: And then also across the board from the first year to the second year I put in a 3% increase for cost of living and inflation.

John Kennedy: Which I think is up to like 4.5 or something now.

Daniel Clendenning: We can adjust that.

Laura Littlepage: So, any questions on the first one?

Daniel Clendenning: If you do have any questions after the meeting if something comes up, feel free to e-mail me.

Laura Littlepage: Marilyn, we're looking at, starting on page 36 of the plan, the budget numbers to see if they were reasonable, to see if anybody has suggestions or issues. And Eric is stuck in DC at this point, to bring you up to date. So we were just looking at the numbers that Daniel put together to see if they made sense, if they are reasonable to everybody. And he started with what we accomplished, we talked with different agencies to see what kind of staff we would need to do that and what level, whether it would be a case worker or manager or director and got estimates from the BLS of what that person makes. So that's how the budgets were prepared. If something like mileage came up, we put that in and tried to anticipate expenses that would be needed.

Rhonda Allen: Are we still on A or have we moved to B?

Laura Littlepage: If no one has questions on it, I guess we can move to B.

Rhonda Allen: OK. I didn't hear any questions so let's move on to the next, B.

Laura Littlepage: OK. And, the methodology was the same for each of them. B was basically continuing to have someone support the EIPC, whether it's us or some other people.

John Brandon: I do have a question about the budget for this. Is this person seen as Council staff since the EIPC is a body authorized by the City-County Council or is this that sort of out there?

Laura Littlepage: That would be up to the council to decide.

John Brandon: OK.

Laura Littlepage: But the idea was that there would be some money in the budget to continue to have support staff for the council. Is there any questions on that one?

Marilyn Pfisterer: Laura? If I may, I've gone through the numbers and there are a lot of background things that I don't have experience in, so they seem to be perfectly reasonable. I guess my question is, were there any revenue sources identified?

Laura Littlepage: Well, that was something that Eric asked me to talk to the group about for each of the areas to see if there were any suggestions about revenue sources for each of these, any possibilities?

Marilyn Pfisterer: OK. And my second question is, and I know that this has been controversial in the past, but there was a discussion about having McCoy have this because many of things that we're talking about here are things that McCoy already does.

Laura Littlepage: Right.

Marilyn Pfisterer: And it seemed to be more fiscally prudent to go with an established organization already that would hold down, that in itself would hold down expenses.

Laura Littlepage: And the idea behind these is that there would be an RFP process and this is to give you an idea of probably what the ranges would be, what might come in. So if there was an RFP process for say the first one then of course McCoy would apply for it. But rather than just naming, at least from the previous discussion, naming McCoy straight out there was a feeling that it should be an RFP process that people could apply and that doesn't mean that McCoy wouldn't be the one that was named but that it would be open.

Marilyn Pfisterer: OK.

Laura Littlepage: And these are to give the EIPC an idea of what the cost would be. For the first one, John gave us an idea of what the estimates would be to do this work. That one was probably the best one because it was from an actual organization that does the work and the others we estimated as best we could. But we just wanted you to have an idea of how much cost we were talking about for each of these aspects of the plan so that when we say that we're recommending that we do any of these things, such as distribute educational materials, to have that awareness campaign, what do the numbers look like to do that.

Marilyn Pfisterer: OK.

Laura Littlepage: For each of them. Because I know a lot of times it sounds like a good idea but how much is it going to cost me? So we tried to give you some idea. If somebody else could come in with an RFP and respond to the proposal, it could be half that, or twice as much. But at least then you have a range to say well, we think it's probably in this ballpark so when you get the responses back you have an idea if it seems reasonable or not. That was our goal for putting together the budget, to give you some ballpark. So any other questions on B? Ready for C? We met with the children's...the preschool group? It's basically preschool teachers, preschool throughout the state, that they were their advocacy group?

John Brandon: IAEYC? The Indiana Association of the Education of Young Children? Diana Walls?

Laura Littlepage: Yes, you got it. We met with her so we got some idea of what would be needed to do some, because that's a lot of what they do, distributing and training and that kind of thing. Our idea was to have, for training, to start out in the beginning here with a supervisor at half time because a lot of the training materials would have to be developed. And so that would be a higher level person to develop it and then the second year it would be, they would just be more supervisory and the full time person would actually be going out and doing the training and making sure things got distributed.

John Brandon: And again, Laura, that could be a contracted position?

Laura Littlepage: Oh, definitely.

John Brandon: And again, may reduce your costs even further.

Laura Littlepage: Right. Again, we're just trying to give an idea of what costs were. If someone had in-house and they responded to the RFP it'd probably be cheaper for them to do it that way. No questions? And then D, on the Mental Health Centers, obviously if you read the mental health section there's a lot of need there and this is not addressing that need. This is basically to have someone be an advocate to try to accomplish some of the goals that we've suggested. And again, if this was contracted out to an organization it might be more efficient if they had someone who would be doing that take on some of these roles. We wanted to have someone that was basically a full time job to try to lobby for some of these things and try to advocate.

John Brandon: OK this was the one that confused me because it talks about an advocate but I don't see an advocate listed in terms of a staff. It says it has a full time staff support person so is that one in the same person?

Daniel Clendenning: Yes, that is the advocate.

John Brandon: OK.

Laura Littlepage: We budgeted at the support staff level rather than at a director level.

John Brandon: OK. In terms of a revenue source, one thing I did think of is would the Mental Health Centers be able to contribute, I know their budgets are tight too, could they contribute a portion, almost like a membership or a stake in this advocate where they take 5% of the total cost, each takes on 5% since they also would gain benefit from the work that this person is doing on their behalf.

Brant Ping: Have we asked the centers whether or not they already have this position? I would have thought they'd have a lobbyist already.

John Brandon: A policy person or something.

Laura Littlepage: At the roundtable did that come up?

Daniel Clendenning: It didn't come up, no but we can look into that and if we do that person could certainly expand their work to include this and it'd be a lot cheaper than hiring a support staff.

Laura Littlepage: The impression we got from the roundtable is their focus is just getting through what they need to get through and not looking at some of the bigger picture issues.

Rhonda Allen: I'd be surprised if they don't already have somebody that serves in this capacity.

John Brandon: Unless they utilize the State Mental Health Association who obviously has a public policy advocacy person. The centers themselves may not have the budget to have that sort of person.

Laura Littlepage: We'll double check on that. And really, this one was, there was so much need here and if we tried to price it out it would have been – and the funding sources, a lot of the issues are Federal, they are way beyond what Marion County can address so that's why we thought having an advocate try maybe at least be a voice for this rather than pricing out all the changes because we're talking millions and millions and millions of dollars that are needed really to address some of those issues and that are larger than Marion County. And Appendix E is the Early Intervention Case Management. And again this was one that if for example NACS would, if we did an RFP and they would apply for it, it could be something to expand them. It's not necessarily a new group at all. It's just the idea that we talked to them and they're serving a pretty small number of kids compared to what we estimate is needed and I think they'd agree with that. I think they would be happy to expand if there were funds available. I think that's fair to say.

John Brandon: My only comment on that budget is in the overhead line item. It seemed to me to be very small compared to the total cost. That's like 5%, if the total budget is almost \$325,000 we're talking less than \$24,000 for overhead. I don't know if that's enough.

Laura Littlepage: Didn't they say they get 10%? NACS had 10%. But you don't do overhead on the travel.

Daniel Clendenning: The overhead is just calculated on the wages and not travel and communication expenses.

John Brandon: I just think if you are going to employ potentially 7 people, think about what it would cost to make sure 7 people have desks, computers, telephones, etc, etc. To me, that just doesn't seem like enough dollars to adequately equip them.

Brant Ping: Well, and space rental as well, John. That surprises me, in that the first one I think was like 26% for overhead, so quite a disparity.

Daniel Clendenning: The 2<sup>nd</sup> one is 26%. The reason it was 26% there is we based that on the University which is the current arrangement we have right now. We're the support staff and our overhead is 26%. I agree that 10% overhead is quite low but that's the estimate we got from NACS as to their overhead expenses.

Laura Littlepage: We can up that if you think we should, we don't have a problem with that.

Daniel Clendenning: It's going to depend too, at the end of the day, who takes on this case management portion. If it's a new organization completely their overhead cost is going to be much higher. I don't know how much excess capacity NACS has as far as facilities as such. If they do have excess capacity then the 10% might not be terribly unreasonable.

John Brandon: That's true.

Brant Ping: I think, Daniel, we should calculate it on the basis that it doesn't exist and give everyone a fair idea of what that budget is going to look like and not make the presumption that a certain agency is going to expand and lower that overhead. Because it's really costly to get those things started up.

Daniel Clendenning: Absolutely.

Laura Littlepage: We can make all the overhead rates the 26% if you think that's reasonable.

Brant Ping: 26% seems high to me, I don't know.

Rhonda Allen: 5 seems low and 26 seems high.

Laura Littlepage: 20?

Brant Ping: 15?

John Kennedy: Depends on your start up costs.

Brant Ping: Start up costs, yes.

Laura Littlepage: We could add a line specifically for start up in year one, that could be for equipment and stuff and then keep the overhead like at 15. Does that sound reasonable? So we can have some desks, computers, whatever, put in \$5,000 or something that seems reasonable for that, the number of people depending on which one it is.

Rhonda Allen: I guess I have a question about the numbers in general with this kind of program because this seems like a very low, small, budget compared to what we spend for NACS now for a smaller portion of kids to be served. So if you are looking to broadening this to the potential of 38 thousand kids. I mean, I'm wondering how many kids is this going to serve because this just seems like a lower amount than what would be necessary to support them.

Daniel Clendenning: We were basing this on each case manager serving up to 25 children at any given time.

Rhonda Allen: OK.

Daniel Clendenning: And this is a really rough estimate. Based on 25 children at a time we estimated that the turnover would be such that that would probably mean each case manager would serve roughly 400 distinct children over the course of a year. And I don't know if that's reasonable or not but talking to

the people at NACS and speaking with Eric it seems like three months is a reasonable average length for a child to be in service. So, if every three months they're turning over and a case manager can bring new in, we're estimating they can serve about 400 children each over the course of a year.

Rhonda Allen: That time frame was imposed by us, correct? That was not a time frame that was a natural time frame. They just worked with the family for three months and it seemed that on average that families, their services closed. We imposed that three months on to them so that it didn't go on so that we could get turnover for another family to participate. So that's probably not a realistic time frame.

Daniel Clendenning: OK.

Patricia Jones: In the real world.

Rhonda Allen: Right.

Brant Ping: We might actually go back and talk with the NACS people and see if that does bring their task to completion. Rhonda, I think it does tend, what happened is they kept wanting to hold on to the families and families kept wanting to hold on to them so we did impose that because we wanted them to transition out and pick up a new family. But it seems like last time I talked with them,

Laura Littlepage: They seemed when we talked to them, we asked them about that actually and they thought that in general for most families 3 months actually worked out pretty well. There were some that would have open issues like Medicaid pending or something like that but some of those, what they'd actually do is start them again and so they'd give them another case number.

John Brandon: That's another issue.

Laura Littlepage: But in general, the impression I got from them, is they thought it was – I mean there is always families that probably could go on for three years but in general three months was pretty reasonable for what they were trying to do. But, you guys are the experts so if you think we should change it we could change it to six months and that would change things around.

Brant Ping: I would rather see it shorter. John, do you think?

John Kennedy: Well, I think three months is the minimum.

Brant Ping: You think minimum?

John Kennedy: Families just don't right themselves quickly if they are at risk and there are multitudes of problems that families have. What you hope for is get the families linked up to services right away and they build some momentum toward success but we have seen families, particular with status offense,

who go well for a while and then there's a bump in the road, someone loses a job and they fall apart and you move in and try to shore that up and you back off and so I think that's the course of things. And I think it does take about 3 months to keep them engaged and keep them focused on their goal.

Brant Ping: OK.

Laura Littlepage: So, do you think we should put an average higher than 3 months?

John Kennedy: I don't believe average higher than that.

Brant Ping: The higher you go, the less families you'll be serving. The need is so pressing by what we've defined that I would much rather see...

John Kennedy: When you engage these families you set that parameter up in the very beginning. You just don't let be some unknown number and surprise them. This is the time frame and this is what we are going to accomplish. The very focus of intense case management idea is not to let it be open-ended where the families aren't then put to task to get things completed. And there are specific goals along the way families have to accomplish and when they can't get those goals met you back off and take a look at where they are to being ready for change and then you motivate them to get to the next level. I mean, it's not just monitoring families, giving out referrals and sitting back and hoping families are going to connect with community services, it's a very proactive approach if you are going to do it in three months.

Laura Littlepage: And NACS, when we talked to them, they go to the peoples house and work with them where they are, which is why there's so much for mileage because they're driving a lot.

John Kennedy: And some families may need less than that and so I think it was just mentioned – I can't remember who said it – but if the families do need something after a case is closed it doesn't take as long presumably to get them up and running again.

Laura Littlepage: So keep three months? Or no?

Rhonda Allen: NACS would know. I just wanted to make sure it wasn't just based on our imposing the three month limitation on them.

Laura Littlepage: And then is the number we are aiming for, we thought we'd 5% in the first year and 7 ½ % of the at risk – is that reasonable?

Rhonda Allen: Well, I guess this takes us back to the three months because it depends on what 2,000 kids are being served. Because if we're thinking that DCS and Juvenile Justice are taking care of the top layer of kids who are at risk, if this 2,000 is the next tier down then they're high needs. Those families are really high needs. They're on the cusp of coming in. And so, I can see three months maybe not being

enough for that group. But if they're maybe a mix 3 or 4 tiers down and they just have a few issues that need to be address then I can see three months easily being done. So, I like the three month minimum.

Brant Ping: OK.

Laura Littlepage: And so maybe an average of four or five months? Because if you have a three month minimum, then you are going to have a higher than three month average.

Rhonda Allen: Right. Because it just depends on what kid.

Laura Littlepage: Right. And I think it makes sense to be flexible if you have a kid that has high need instead of closing it and opening it again.

John Brandon: Can we establish targets, and say this is recognizing the family needs are different?

Laura Littlepage: Targeted at three months but understanding that there can be some that go as long as six. Maybe have six as a maximum?

John Brandon: Right. I think there has to be a maximum then you can have a range of say three to five or whatever.

Laura Littlepage: Three to six? Does that sound reasonable? John, you seem to have a good sense of this.

John Kennedy: Yes, I think the provider can put in place a group of processes where they are reviewing where the families are going. It may be there is some recommendation that could be made to move the family along or decide that the family is not going to be engaged and with the families input maybe opt out. The families need changes and the children's need changes as they grow older and the idea I think is try to get with these families early. We're starting to see problems at the school level age, some of the children we see, or youth that we see in case management, have already been through, already been identified by someone that they were going to be in trouble but there wasn't a program there for them and so they find their feet and become runners or so that the older kids that we see it takes sometimes a lot longer of just three months because their needs change. You can get a group of families where there are young children in that and start surrounding them with services or linking them up with community services or families that can help them that'd probably greatly edit that.

Laura Littlepage: That's the goal is to keep them from ever getting to you or you or you.

Rhonda Allen: Right.

Tom Stucky: Some of this is a strategic decision in terms of how you want to approach the idea reach this, as I understand it, completely unmet need at this point. So one approach would be to say here is

the scope of the problem and here is the real amount of money you are going to need to really do this. I suspect a lot of people would say that's right, have a nice day. Based on what I have seen so far. So I think maybe one strategic decision you might make is to say here's a reasonable first step, recognizing that maybe for some of these families this isn't the perfect solution but this is certainly better than nothing which is what we currently have given the reality that right now we don't necessarily have specific revenue streams that are dedicated to this. So, I only bring this up because it seems to me that that's a real serious consideration that would be worth thinking about is to what extent can we do what we really want to do versus what we realistic want to get accomplished in the first couple of years. Just to kind of keep that in mind as we go.

John Kennedy: Well, we are dreaming. This is a pie in the sky. You reach far and wide and come up with a perfect design then reality says you take what you can get.

Laura Littlepage: Well, that brings us back to, I heard one suggestion for funding from John about having the Mental Health Advocate, if it's needed. Does anybody have suggestions from any other pieces on how to fund that?

John Kennedy: Well, there are several agencies that you probably have already talked to that have case management. I think that the issue might be is how are you going to collect information of these families at risk, at point do they get parceled out to existing agencies rather than creating just a case management program for this level of functioning of the family's needs. So the referral needs to come in somewhere and you're linking these families with existing programs based upon the need.

Laura Littlepage: Part of what we were doing here though, in talking with NACS, is that even if there was someone to refer to, they just can't serve that many more. They're serving what they can but it's a pretty small number compared to what it seems like the need is. So even if we had someone to do that, and tried to save money that way, there is nobody to do that case management that has excess capacity, basically it seems like.

Rhonda Allen: I have a question. Early on, and so I'm going back to early days when this group was created, it seemed like there was a big focus on funding and revenue sources and it was part of the big investigation with the DCS budget. And so I guess I need my memory refreshed because I don't know what other sources were. I seems like that would have been the job of whoever was looking at the budgets and really evaluating all that. I thought that was going to be a component of that, is that that person was going also to be looking at other revenue sources. Because I'm sitting here I think the reason there is \$104 million budget for DCS is because nobody knows what those revenue sources are and we need somebody to help us identify those.

Laura Littlepage: Well, that is part of what Daniel was looking at when he did his financial analysis.

Daniel Clendenning: Yes, but I didn't really find any solid answers. Medicaid is influx right now. They're talking about revising the rules for case management and frankly if Congress is dealing with that right

now, they're saying basically that CMS has gone a little too far with that but still they haven't passed a bill to stop CMS from doing that so that could still be enacted sometime in the next year or so. And if that happens there could be even less money for this sort of work because that's going to drastically limit what's covered as case management under Medicaid. But if that does get stopped and I'm hoping that won't be the case, and if that isn't then I think Medicaid case management money could be used for some of this work, as long as the children and families are eligible for Medicaid. The cases where they're not eligible for Medicaid, it's basically state and local.

John Kennedy: The idea of early intervention is trying to help these families before there's a diagnosis, which in some cases is part of the eligibility requirement to receive services. Do we know of any other communities across the Midwest or across the country that have created funding sources for children and families besides state level?

Daniel Clendenning: Nothing that I'm aware of. I mean, another option, too, is to, I discussed this with Eric some, is to charge small fees to the families for the service but some families aren't going to use the service if you charge them to use it.

John Kennedy: Not with the gas prices.

Daniel Clendenning: I think part of it is unfortunately just trying to get involved in the political process and to sell the idea that by performing early intervention you are going to reduce costs in the future. But it can be hard to sell that because the numbers aren't very – you know, when I buy an air conditioning unit I know the efficiency and can say I'll save this much money, I can amortize it out and figure out how much it was to buy it. But with this, the estimates, they're not as precise so it's hard to say exactly how much money are we're going to save by engaging in early intervention.

John Kennedy: We know how much money we may end up spending on the other end of it though, which is a lot.

Laura Littlepage: Spend a little to save a lot.

Marilyn Pfisterer: There were discussions about grants and perhaps this is trotting out the name that always comes to mind is Lilly endowment and I use that loosely to represent all those things out there. I remember the discussion but I don't remember the result of the investigation.

Laura Littlepage: Eric met with a few of those funders and basically their pushback was that if the city takes the first step they might be willing to work but they were not going to be the leader. And that was part, remember we talked about the Coordinating Agency budget, the person in there was to be a grant writer, that was part of their responsibility, is to be the one to actually write these grants and try and get some of that money. So that was why that's the first step was because that person could hopefully identify some of these places and get some funds for some of these other things.

John Brandon: One of the things that immediately comes to mind, I think, is there might be some national level foundations who would be interested in making an investment in this as a start up pilot project. But I think the critical thing is the sustainability of time. That's always the issue with foundation funding is that it's generally very much a time limited investment by a private funder who has an expectation that over that period of time that you develop and solidify the program and line up sustainable funding so that you can keep moving. But that's no reason why we shouldn't be looking at perhaps some larger national foundations who might be willing to make an investment in an effort such as this because if we can't say that it's something people are doing across the board then this might be something they'd be interested in saying let's see if we can make this work and perhaps replicate it in other locations.

Marilyn Pfisterer: And piggy backing on what John was just talking about if we had the start up funding and the program was as successful as we intend it to be, then some of the agencies that are currently spending vast amounts of money on children who have come into the system who are no longer receiving that number of children could cost shift some of that funding to the early intervention side of things. Have I explained it clearly?

Laura Littlepage: Right. The problem though of course is that now it's all state money and if this is a Marion County program if the state would be willing, if they did shift money, what time period would it take for that to show up and then shift it down for early intervention. That's the whole political thing Daniel was talking about.

Marilyn Pfisterer: And a legislative issue?

Laura Littlepage: Right.

Rhonda Allen: Now is an interesting time to at public, private partnership startup opportunities since we do have the new state funding. But it would be interesting to see if state, local, private kind of partnership, and it has to happen elsewhere because most other states are state funded, their child welfare systems are state funded. So there's got to be some sort of model out there.

Laura Littlepage: Another thing that Eric wanted me to talk to you about is the next steps on this. Who else we should talk to about this and that was one of the things that possibly those people might have some funds for some of this. So are there other City Council people that we should talk to or Deputy Mayor Olgen Williams? We talked to his assistant but we haven't gotten with him yet. Or are there people outside that circle? Who else should we be sharing this with and bringing on board?

Marilyn Pfisterer: I would suggest the Controller because he has the grasp on the entire funding scene.

Laura Littlepage: OK. And then, the second part of that question is, who on the EIPC would be willing to go meet with whoever they suggest?

Rhonda Allen: I'll go.

John Kennedy: I could.

Laura Littlepage: Just because we think it would make sense to have someone from the Council when we meet with these stakeholders to show that it's not just us, that there is Council backing for what we're trying to do.

John Kennedy: I could go as well. I guess another question I have as well, are we envisioning this as sort of a phased in process over a particular time frame or have we even had that discussion?

Laura Littlepage: That's your call. I think that's the Council's call.

John Kennedy: Have we even had this discussion?

Laura Littlepage: That's the councils call. What do you think? Does the Council think we should try to move all of it at once? Or pick pieces, say for the first year and then have something for the latter year? That is really up to you.

Patricia Jones: Are we focused enough at this point to make that recommendation to you?

Laura Littlepage: That's your decision.

Patricia Jones: I'm not sure we have narrowed this down yet, at least in my mind, that we are ready to make that recommendation. Obviously we don't have funding so a phase in of some sort makes sense.

Laura Littlepage: Right.

Patricia Jones: What one position, what key position, do we have our package in to sell it to whomever we need to sell this to at this point, conceptualized enough in our minds and focused enough at this point to do that?

Laura Littlepage: We think it is. But that's because we've been living and breathing it and writing it. So that's why I say it is your decision because we are so involved it's hard to step back. If you don't think that it's ready, it's your call. But we have been talking about this over a year.

Patricia Jones: But I mean which position when you are saying "phase in", which part of the piece is what I am referring to.

Laura Littlepage: Oh, which should be first?

Patricia Jones: Right.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Given that question, and I'm kind of formulating this in my mind as I'm talking so it may not come out well, as this is presented to the city and we're getting down to the funding issues at this point and considering the phase in, would it not be feasible, would it not be prudent to not only take the numbers that you've already given us but to perhaps break out some of those positions that are absolutely essential for the phase in and give those numbers as a starting point, this is step one.

Laura Littlepage: But which piece does the Council say is essential?

Marilyn Pfisterer: I'm not experienced enough with mental health issues to make that decision.

Rhonda Allen: Does anybody have priorities? I guess my opinion is the coordinating agency piece is the priority. That's where we started.

Laura Littlepage: If I had to pick, that's what I would pick. But like I said, that's not my job. But I think it makes sense just because they could be applying for grants, they could be trying to get nonprofits together, they could be working on some of these bigger picture things. And if you eventually did have a mental health advocate, they might even work with that coordinating agency group so you would have the grants and advocacy piece together.

John Brandon: I was thinking those two. Because if you've got someone who is working in that particular area, at least in mental health which is a big chunk of what we are talking about here, they are already going to be building those legislative relationships, they are going to be identifying significant issues, maybe even bringing additional dollars in to provide the services that these families are sorely in need of so it seems to me that those two pieces that would go together.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Just so I have clear in my mind the process, this would go before state and local officials, I'll just make it broad, state and local officials before there would be a RFP process.

Laura Littlepage: Oh, yes, definitely. That's why we said who should we take it to share with. We want to try to get it by as many people as we can to let them know what we are thinking of and then of course there has to be approval from the City-County Council for this and at some point this group has to approve it and then we have to move it to the Council. Do you think you, are you ready to vote on it now? That's up to the group to move it along or not.

Rhonda Allen: Well, I guess the question I have about the vote is, it seems to me that the plan itself if you take the budget out and the numbers that the plan looks great. And so I don't think you'll have any problems with anybody here, but I'm taking a guess here, about the plan. I think the hiccup is the with the budget and if we don't have other identified revenue sources, it just seems like it's futile to go to all these people if we don't have some sort of plan on how we're going to offset the cost to the tax payer. If we're also looking at other people, I think that I probably need to take this to the folks, the executive staff at DCS, the budget folks, to at least – I'm sure they are not going to sign on the dotted line to say

whatever cost savings we're going to shift back to you – but to at least see if that's even a possibility, if we're able to get these things going and we do see a true cost savings to the budget will you at least get a sentiment. That took us a little bit away from “are we ready to vote.” And so I don't know what you guys think. That was just my thought about between the plan and the budget piece that goes with the plan.

Marilyn Pfisterer: If we're not ready to vote, what would yet be the item to be decided?

Laura Littlepage: Right, so what more do you need, basically, for us to do before you're ready to vote?

John Kennedy: Other ideas for funding streams that don't include DCS or the tax payers.

Marilyn Pfisterer: I laugh because I'm particularly in favor of the last part. But, we've worked with this for what? Two years now? And if there haven't been additional funding streams identified at this point I don't know where else we could go?

Laura Littlepage: I think that's basically what we've come down to.

John Brandon: What is the, and maybe you'd know Marilyn, is the status of the dollars that the previous administration had identified as their crime prevention dollars that were to come out of the increase in the local county income tax? Have those dollars been allocated, are they still gathering together or do you know? Because it would seem to me that this body could make a very strong case that the work that we propose doing with helping families could be a pretty strong crime prevention effort. It's obviously not putting more police officers on the street or things of that nature but these are the source of many of the folks that end up in the criminal justice system down the line. So I'm not saying that would be the total piece but maybe there are some dollars that could be allocated from those funds. I just don't know what the status is of that at this point in time. I mean, I don't know if the staff has had that discussion.

Marilyn Pfisterer: I can't speak for the staff but I can speak to some of those issues. That COALIT money, some of it is dedicated for specific issues. The pension liability is being phased in so there is still some burden on MC to provide that and with the fuel for public safety going up exponentially just like it is for everybody else, we have to find the way to fund gas for the police cars and gas for the fire trucks and gas for the DPW trucks for the rest of the year. So, while I sound pretty negative, and intentionally so, I think that money is pretty much consumed although it would not hurt to at least bring that subject up because I think that argument can be made. It's not a matter of the value of the argument, it's a matter of stretching that dollar far enough to be able to fund this project.

Rhonda Allen: Well, I agree with the earlier comment that Councilor Pfisterer made, and that is that we haven't identified the funding sources. We just need to be honest, though, about when this gets presented, when we do talk to all these people, we don't have – I mean, its tax payer. That's really what it comes down to. So I just wanted to be sure we're clear that we just have to be honest about where we expect the money to come from.

Patricia Jones: And that its money well spent.

Rhonda Allen: It's money well spent. Absolutely.

Patricia Jones: Well, it's there, we just don't – it's thinking outside the box.

Laura Littlepage: There have been studies that have shown if you spend, and I can pull up the literature, but if you spend a dollar on prevention, you save. It's exponential but it's six or seven dollars down the line. But it's not this year. It's ten years later. It takes a while to see those savings and that's the problem because if you see it automatically then everyone would fund it, but it's not automatic. It takes times. You really need to save that money to catch the kids like you were talking about when the kids are 6, or 7.

Marilyn Pfisterer: In the survey that was done, was there a question posed to the courts to see if there would be funding from, a source of funding from the courts to support this?

Laura Littlepage: The survey?

Marilyn Pfisterer: Well, as you talked with...

Laura Littlepage: Oh, we didn't look at the courts, I don't think, for funding.

Daniel Clendenning: No.

Marilyn Pfisterer: I'm not going to imply that I know that there is a source there because I really do not. But I just wondered with the different programs that there have been if there might be a small source there. I'm sure it wouldn't be a major source.

John Kennedy: Would it be useful if we are going to be making a recommendation for the plan then we are also giving our best ideas about the funding stream, to include all the above and the two choices we always seem to get stuck with. We seem to default back to DCS and tax payers. I'm not sure I could take this discussion any further than that, I just remember the days I worked at the University of Oklahoma and looking at all the other different kinds of programs universities bring in to do research, early childhood development, organizations that are looking at children's health, and we're talking about children's health in a way. Children's health is compromised a great deal when families are in trouble. So I don't know if there is an expert in the field that looks across all disciplines that include public safety, early childhood development, juvenile justice, department of child services, to see where that goes.

Laura Littlepage: And there might be some federal money in something like the NIH that looks at prevention. The issue comes back to what John says, even if you got money for that for the first couple of years, for anything to be sustainable you'd still have to have some revenue later down the line.

John Kennedy: And I understand that argument and it's certainly one that cannot be refuted. It's just that if I'm going to be stuck with how am I going to pay for it five years from now I'm not getting anything going.

Laura Littlepage: I know what you are saying.

John Kennedy: We need to see it in action steps. The public, the sustainability part and that's what start up monies do. They try to gather good information and data so it can sell the public on the sustainability part.

Tom Stucky: Well, one possibility would be to considering thinking about, rather than this big budget, thinking about the coordinating agency as the first chunk and then thinking about if it's possible to, rather than saying well the tax payers are going to come up with the \$180,000 for the first year or whatever it's going to be, think about if you can talk to the administration about what, we realize that \$5 million has suddenly gotten a lot smaller with gas prices and all that, but what about \$90 thousand? Can you consider \$90 thousand as an investment up front and then once you get that potential commitment, go to Lilly or some of the other funders and say we've got a commitment here and for this money and get the process rolling and then start to think about, so it's not simply this – I don't know what the total number would be if you add all those budgets together for the first year – but to start to think in smaller steps and then it becomes considerably more palatable for people to say well, ok. Because the reality, unfortunately, is that by not funding this you are making a choice, and the choice is that we are going to spend a whole lot more money for DCS and we're going to spend a whole lot more money for Juvenile Justice system and ultimately in the adult justice system. There is no question, the evidence is crystal clear that if you spend this money now, you will save money down the road. Yes, it's more expensive now but it will save you and guess what? It will save you a lot in terms of happiness, in terms of crime prevention, everything. So, not spending money is a choice.

John Kennedy: And by getting it out there and getting things started you are able to show all the institutions that are working with children and families that it might be prudent for everybody to pitch in a small percentage every year for prevention, early intervention. And that'd be across the board. Including education and health.

Rhonda Allen: And we're back to whether we're ready for a vote.

John Kennedy: This is a good plan. And I think the next piece is that what are our ideas about how to do this in terms of the dollars. Do we want to approve the plan but have another recommendation as to where the funding might be?

Patricia Jones: I think we are ready to do that today.

Laura Littlepage: OK.

Rhonda Allen: Then I think we just call for a vote of the existing 2008 Plan for Improving Early Intervention Services for Children and Youth and Their Families in Marion County.....that's a big title.

John Kennedy: I have a question. On the Representing Council Members, the first page, does that need to be updated?

Rhonda Allen: It probably does.

John Kennedy: Because I don't know if you are using the language when it was first formed but certain the Marion County Office of Family and Children is wrong.

Laura Littlepage: Yes, this was from when it was first formed so that's from the actual Council.

Rhonda Allen: I don't think Chris Ball is a judge, yet anyway.

Brant Ping: We need to change that.

Taren Duncan: I'm not a director. I'm a Deputy Director.

Laura Littlepage: Appointed by, representing DCS. OK, we'll fix those. We'll change that, that's no problem. This is from the original legislation. We haven't updated it.

Rhonda Allen: OK then, other than some of the editing that needs to occur, any other discussion? OK, then we're back to calling for the vote. Since we don't really have any bylaws, I can do this the way I want, can't I? All those in favor of approving this plan as it is with the exception of some editing, please signify by saying "Aye".

ALL: Aye.

Rhonda Allen: All those opposed to this plan? I didn't hear anyone opposed so the plan passes unanimously. Eric will be very happy that we actually have this in place.

Laura Littlepage: Yes, he will. That brings me to my next question, do we want to meet in July? Because his thought was that perhaps we could meet with stakeholders and then having a meeting in August. With summer vacations and everything, getting some of these meetings that we're talking about, and if there's other people you think we need to meet with, let us know. Right now we have the Controller, we have Rhonda meeting with the state people, and who else was there? Anybody else mentioned?

Patricia Jones: I think you might consider meeting with the superintendents. They have a superintendents meeting and it would be nice to update them as a group in Marion County. That would make sense.

Laura Littlepage: OK. Will you come to that with us?

Patricia Jones: I'd be happy to.

Marilyn Pfisterer: I did talk with Dr. White and he indicated to me that they would be on hiatus until September.

Patricia Jones: OK, so the first meeting would be in September. You could send them the documents so they could read it and be prepared.

Laura Littlepage: We'll share it with them. That makes sense. Anybody else you think we should meet with to bring up to speed on this?

Rhonda Allen: I would say your mental health forum, the folks that you met with already to take this back to them.

Laura Littlepage: OK. And then our next step since it is approved is to take it to City-County Council - is it Rules and Policy?

Marilyn Pfisterer: It probably would be Rules and Policy but President Cockrum would be the one to determine that finally.

Laura Littlepage: So should we meet with him then?

Marilyn Pfisterer: I would suggest that and I would be glad to go with you. And I would also be glad to go with whomever to the Controller if I can work that out in my schedule.

Laura Littlepage: OK.

Rhonda Allen: Do we need to address the phase-in piece at all here and if there are priorities on how we want to rank those?

Laura Littlepage: That would be helpful.

Rhonda Allen: Because it seems like that would come up with some of the stakeholders with their questions.

Laura Littlepage: I think that would be very useful if the group could talk about it. What do you think of Tom's suggestion of asking for half and then trying to get the other half? Does that seem reasonable?

John Brandon: I'll do some research in terms of national sorts of foundations that might support this sort of work. And at least try to get a list of folks and some of their guidelines for application and etc to see if it's even, if there are folks out there who would be looking at it. It might be helpful, I guess this is actually where staff could be very helpful, is actually looking at those other sources of funds. Are there education funds, are there NIH funds, are there DOJ funds, CDC, government services sorts of dollars that are out there that we might be able to tap in to.

Laura Littlepage: Part of that depends on the timing. These things are let out and they have three months to reply so there might not be anything now but that's something that we can keep our eye out and see if something comes along that would fit. We can still look and see what's out there.

Daniel Clendenning: Regarding Tom's comment, too, about perhaps funding only half of the Coordinating Agency budget in the first year, if the Council is interested in that and would like to look at a different phase-in plan, we could do a different budget where instead of year one and year two we maybe have a three year or four year budget where it phases in at a lower amount the first year. Perhaps the first year we have half the staff that we have in the first year here initially. An option like that would be very easy to look at and I'd be happy to pull that together.

Laura Littlepage: Or, the idea would be to try to get the first year but have the council to pay for half and half, try to get another funder for the other half.

John Brandon: I think we have to be careful that we don't underestimate what it is going to take for us to have the impact that we need and we would probably be making a mistake to do that to set somebody up, for a sense, for failure because they don't have the resources, really have the impact then it becomes much more difficult to make the sale, you don't accomplish what need to have happen. So, we might be better off, I think we need to be careful to slice and dice because we may not, in doing that we may take away the power that's necessary to make, to really get the impact.

Rhonda Allen: Do we know what the, I mean this is probably a bigger discussion, what the sole source guidelines are? If we're going to use county money to potential start this first year, what are the sole source guidelines? Because, I'm back to what Councilor Pfisterer said earlier, which is we already have somebody that does this.

Laura Littlepage: We thought that it would be people who are already existing that would respond to the RFP.

Rhonda Allen: You wouldn't have to do an RFP if there was some sort of sole source.

Laura Littlepage: And that's the Council's call. There is the possibility to do sole source and that's why we originally had identified McCoy. But then there was some pushback that said we should do it as an open RFP. So that would be the Council's decision.

Rhonda Allen: So what are the other priorities? When you look at the five areas, I think we should prioritize all five of those and not just look at the first one. What is the Council's recommendations or thoughts about the rest? I wrote down what I thought. I'll get us going. I have them in this order: A B E D and C. And so B being the support for this group, because I think if that doesn't happen nobody on this Council is able to absorb what you all do to help support this important aid. And then E is the direct service piece and D education. I mean, I really didn't want to throw that in the fourth but something had to come fourth and then C, mental health. That's not my call, just my thoughts.

John Brandon: I had ABDEC, so we're close.

Patricia Jones: I had AB, so we have the top two. If we could get three,

John Brandon: Build from there.

Rhonda Allen: What have you got, Taren?

Taren Duncan: Mine is exactly like yours.

Rhonda Allen: OK. So we've still got A B.

John Kennedy: A B has to be first.

Rhonda Allen: We're all consistent that it has to be A B? OK.

Patricia Jones: The third one?

John Kennedy: For the third one I had D because again I go back to my whole thing with the mental health issue is so huge and we have a group of folks that we can mobilize as a resource that could really begin to tackle that one particular issue which might carry over into other things.

Marilyn Pfisterer: We had in the discussion prior to this that there may already be a person on staff who could do this. If that is the case, I think that would give solid precedence for putting it third, if it's already in place.

Rhonda Allen: OK. I can live with D.

Patricia Jones: I support D. The mental health needs of the students takes precedence in schools.

Rhonda Allen: So D is number three. Number four?

Tom Stucky: One thing you may want to think about is that different pieces of this may be more attractive to different entities. So I see E as being potentially very attractive to the Lilly's of the world.

The name hasn't been mentioned yet but I don't know if the IU Foundation does anything like this and I certainly would be prepared to say that they do, but it seems to me that Universities locally might be interested in some of those types of things. The very clear advantage here is to be able to say, for E especially, there is an obvious unmet need here and you will have an immediate impact on the lives of people in Marion County if you fund this, or some portion of this. And so I think that foundations would likely, and I think we need to be sort of creative about who would be willing to put up some money for that, but I think that's a pretty attractive piece of this. The Coordinating Agency, that starts to seem very administrative and then there's the question of is it already being done. But I think with the piece that says we are not meeting the needs of these people and if you give us this money we will directly be able to do something that's not currently able to be done, I think that would be a very attractive thing. So one thing to think about, to make a short story long, I guess what I was suggesting is thinking about maybe the different pieces of this being targeted to different funding sources so then you get the blending of the public and private. That's a possibility.

John Kennedy: That brings to mind different ideas and new ideas to engage families. When you do case management, one of the things I often wondered, if we create more positions and more people get served, it becomes sort of a net binding thing where we're doing the same thing we've always done and we're still falling short of resources and there are just more families identified. It'd be interesting to see if somebody has some different way of engaging these families and different methods, different ways of evaluating it. So it could be attractive to education, to do some research on this. Be interesting to see.

Laura Littlepage: And we do have the best practices report where we did look at some of those issues and what different people are doing and what are some of the results and there has been some research on this.

John Kennedy: Look at the Coordinating Agency and make sure it's put into place.

Laura Littlepage: Right. But we have done that. It's in the reports that we did two years ago I think it was. So we have looked at some of that and we even looked at what level of evidence there is for some of the different approaches because some of them have, you know, random assignment and the whole thing, and some of them are just it seemed like it worked but didn't fully...

John Kennedy: It's in the plan as well, I understand that. That's what I think is going to be attractive to some funders as well.

Marilyn Pfisterer: My view, for whatever it's worth, is we've already agreed on A B and D. I agree that E would come next simply because I think C could change as some of these things are put in place. I think the information for the distribution of the education materials may evolve as some of these other things go into place, so it seems logical to me to do that at the end. And I apologize to Patricia. I interrupted you a moment ago.

Patricia Jones: That's not a problem. We're on the same page, that's the important thing.

Laura Littlepage: Well, I think what Tom was saying too, is we might do some of this parallel because there might be somebody even if we're looking for A and B that would be really interested in E and not wait until we got A and B to do E. I mean, if we found someone who was interested in moving that forward. Because that is the one thing that we could really show results from, it serves people rather than administrative which in the long run might help but aren't as sexy.

Patricia Jones: Exactly. Whatever we can market. The marketing part of that would be very appealing.

Laura Littlepage: We do want to match up with people's interest. And there is research to show that this works and it does help people.

Rhonda Allen: OK. So then, we are in agreement for ABDEC, kind of in that order. That's the Council's recommendations however I think knowing that at any given time if any opportunity arises in E, needs to rise to the top, then we can do that. Or any of those that need to rise to the top.

Laura Littlepage: Does the group want to meet in July or are we going to pass on that?

Rhonda Allen: I think I agree with the plan on having some meetings in July and then coming back in August after getting some of that feedback.

John Kennedy: Will this larger group, or this group here, know about when these meetings exist? Or keep us in the loop?

Laura Littlepage: Oh, definitely, we can do that. I can send it out to the Council listserv when we have something. I haven't been doing that with some of the other meetings because I didn't think you wanted to know, but these are higher level than the ones we had before so we can definitely make sure to share that so you know that we've got them schedule.

Rhonda Allen: OK.

Patricia Jones: If you feel you need any of us to go along, just let us know.

Laura Littlepage: Oh, we will.

Patricia Jones: We'd be happy to.

Tom Stucky: I think it would make sense to have a to-do list of meetings, so that in this room can see this list and think, 'Oh yeah, I need to meet with this one'.

Laura Littlepage: We'll pull that out of the minutes and send that out before we send the minutes out.

Marilyn Pfisterer: The meeting with the Controller was planned for what timeframe? Are you thinking about that being in July?

Laura Littlepage: We'll probably start now and check people's schedules and see when it goes. Because you know how that goes between vacations so we'll probably start and see next week on.

Marilyn Pfisterer: John says the budget process is in process right now.

Laura Littlepage: So we'll try to do that as soon as possible.

Marilyn Pfisterer: OK.

John Kennedy: I think we need to prioritize the meetings.

Rhonda Allen: Yes.

Laura Littlepage: The Controller first. Then I think President Cockrum should be up there too.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Yes.

John Brandon: That's A 1, or A 2.

Laura Littlepage: We'll try to get those as soon as we get back to the office and start looking at schedules, because those will probably take a little while but we would like to get them done this month so we can see if we can do something.

John Brandon: Great.

Rhonda Allen: Is there any other business that we need to address? We got everything covered for Eric, Laura?

Laura Littlepage: That was on my list.

Rhonda Allen: OK. Then we're officially adjourned. Thank you.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 am.