

Early Intervention Planning Council
November 12, 2008
Minutes

Members Present:

Rhonda Allen
John Brandon
John Kennedy
Marilyn Pfisterer
Brant Ping

Members Not Present:

Christina Ball
Patricia Jones
Judge Marilyn Moores

Staff Present:

Eric Wright
Tom Stucky
Lyndy Kouns
Laura Littlepage

Guests:

Councillor Bob Cockrum
Jason Dudich
Rebecca Swope

Rhonda Allen: Let's go ahead and get started. Do you want to do the minutes first?

Eric Wright: Yes, might as well. Any questions?

Rhonda Allen: If there are no amendments or additions to be made, then we can approve these as is.

Eric Wright: Any objections?

Rhonda Allen: All right. Did you want to move the survey up to number two?

Eric Wright: Yes, if that's ok?

Rhonda Allen: Then let's do that.

Eric Wright: Tom, do you want to give us an update on the survey?

Tom Stucky: Yes. We have really fancy looking publications. As you know, we did a two stage survey procedure where we started with the youth serving agencies in Marion County. And we actually, through the herculean efforts of the person who is currently typing, Lyndy Kouns, we were able to generate a 70%

response rate. When we started we were not thinking we were going to get that strong of a response rate so it's in large part due to her efforts that we were able to do that. I'm not going to go line by line but there are just a couple of things to note. In Figure 1 on page 5 you can see that the vast majority of these folks were non-profit agencies, which was essentially by design, we knew that was going to be the case but we did have a few for profit and government entities as well. If you look to Figure 2 you'll see that revenues generally are either staying the same or increasing. So the revenue streams are not necessarily decreasing for most of these folks, which is a good thing. Highlighting probably what I think are some of the bigger issues, if you move to page 11 Figure 3, it's pretty clear that the respondents believe that there are a number of gaps in services, which we suspected going into this but it's always good to get confirmation from the people in the field that that is what they are seeing as well. So two-thirds of the respondents identify many gaps in services. And if you flip over to the next page, kind of some reasons why – and there are a number of those – but one that I would highlight, if you go down toward the end there, the lack of funds, 91.3% either strongly agree or agree that lack of funds is one of the reasons why there are gaps in these services. There are also some other areas, geographical gaps or people not knowing about the services and those would potentially suggest some different responses depending on the reasons for the gaps. But clearly the respondents felt there were some fairly specific reasons and there was a lot of agreement on those. I won't spend too much time on the interaction portion of this. We're going to get a lot more information about that from the second part of the survey procedure which is the program level and I'll talk about that in just a minute. But one other thing I wanted to point out is if you go to the end of survey, end of document, if you look at the coordinating agencies, on page 16 in Figure 5. Generally it appears that the majority of people agree that there would be benefit from having a coordinating organization, so over 60% of those folks agreed, and if we include the neither disagree or agree, generally there doesn't seem to be a lot of opposition to a coordinating organization. Now the question as to whether or not there's an existing agency that can fill that role is much less clear. There seems to be less agreement about whether there's an existing agency and there's also less agreement about whether or not a new agency should be created. So at this point I would say that certainly there is not opposition to a coordinating agency but what that organization would look like is not necessarily as clear. For those that mentioned an existing agency, McCoy had the most mentions as an agency that could fill the role with Indiana Youth Institute being the second most. McCoy only had 10 mentions so it certainly wasn't a numerical majority in that circumstance. But generally speaking there were people that did list some existing agencies so I think those are some things that came out of agency side of the survey. So before we move on to the program side, does anyone have questions about the report? And again, I'd like to thank Lyndy Kouns for data collection efforts and Daniel Clendenning for the substantial amount of organization of results.

Rhonda Allen: Did this pretty much affirm any assumptions you had going in to the survey with these agencies?

Tom Stucky: Well, I think that's probably better answered by Eric, but I don't know that there were a lot of surprises in this part of it.

Eric Wright: The most important piece is what Tom mentioned, which was the reaffirmation for the need for a coordinating agency, which is very consistent with the plan we came up with. And I think we'll learn more from the program level survey, we'll actually have more of a detail about what each of these programs are doing. Do you want to update that?

Tom Stucky: As a matter of fact, one of the values of the agency survey was to give us information about the programs that they had. And so then the next step was to go out and survey the programs themselves. And we had a substantial response rate. We had 326 out of 342 programs that responded to the survey. So that is an absolutely outstanding response rate. And we just finished, yesterday as a matter of fact, the data entry portion of that so we'll be going into the data analysis on the program. Now because there's so much more detail there it's going to take us a little while to get through that data. But we think there'll be a lot of information that will come out of that. So sometime in the relatively near future you'll see another shiny packet of information from the program surveys. But absolutely outstanding response rate. That's really fantastic that we were able to get that many programs that were responding. We'll get a lot of good information. And as far as I know, there really has not been a program level survey that has been fielded so this is information that is not really out there anywhere else.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Just to clarify, all of these organizations were contacted initially, all of them. And I agree with you, 70% response rate requires a lot of follow up, so that is outstanding. Over what period of time was this conducted?

Tom Stucky: I'm trying to remember when it was actually started.

Eric Wright: About a year ago now.

Marilyn Pfisterer: OK, so the last 12 months. You say the data entry was just finished.

Eric Wright: We generated the list the end of the fall last year. And then we came back and I think in the January or February we approve the questionnaire and then it went into the field really early spring, late winter. And then the agency survey are the ones that we actually had more difficulty getting, because you are talking about Executive Directors are much more difficult to schedule so that took a long time but once we got through the Executive Director level, the programs were actually much more responsive. Lyndy, would you agree?

Lyndy Kouns: Yes, definitely.

Eric Wright: The data entry for that one, the 300 plus, that's stage two. We hope actually, Tom's going to kill me, but we hope to have a draft of the survey's report by the next meeting. The data are in now. As soon as Daniel gets back I'm going to crack the whip so our hope is to have a draft of that survey by the next meeting. We probably won't have it pretty like this until closer to the end of the month but our hope is to have the survey draft for you all to look at and comment on by the December meeting.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Thank you.

John Brandon: This may be a question that goes to the program level but when you look at the respondents are you able to say, for example, what sector those agencies represent? Because people tend to think of themselves as "we're an after school program" or...

Tom Stucky: I would say that's probably more at the program level because some of these agencies have a broad spectrum, so if you say, like United Way has just a wide range of programming, so some of those things just have a broad spectrum of the kinds of things that they're engaging in. So I really think that's going to be more at the program level that we'll get a much better sense of what it is that they are actually doing with these programs that interact with the youth.

Eric Wright: If you remember, a long time ago we had that theoretical continuum of care, and so the data from the program level were coded so we can actually plot people or programs into that continuum of care so that we can get a better sense of the gap in there. One other piece that is important for the sustainability issue is, we're constructing this data set in a way that whoever becomes the coordinating agency at this point we will just hand over the data, that we already told the agencies we would be giving to them to basically be the foundation for the new information system we've been talking about.

Rhonda Allen: Refresh my memory. The difference between intervention services and treatment services, because I kind of use those terms interchangeably sometimes and clearly they are categories here. So I just want to know, I know the difference between prevention and intervention.

Eric Wright: Which page are you one?

Rhonda Allen: It's page 10, on services in Marion County.

Eric Wright: Well I think we didn't actually give them a definition of that, did we?

Lyndy Kouns: In the program survey we identified specific services. On the agency survey we gave them the three, prevention/intervention/treatment to select from without specifying how those should be defined.

Eric Wright: I suspect we can actually do some more analysis to make sure we understand that, but typically the more clinically oriented people, like mental health providers, tend to refer to it as treatment whereas social services providers use the word intervention. So one could argue quite legitimately that they are synonymous but I think we used those words because clearly they are different cultures if you will, that use different words.

Rhonda Allen: OK, thank you.

Tom Stucky: There is probably a fair degree of overlap between those.

Eric Wright: But it would be really easy to see which ones responded to which and then I can give you a more definitive definition about that.

Rhonda Allen: And I guess the only other comment before we move on, I guess I'm surprised to see on page 7 that the change of revenues for the last three years, most of them have increased. That was not a prediction that I would have made. I would have thought that it would remain the same or decreased.

Tom Stucky: Now, we don't know how much. So we don't know if that's a cost of living increase situation or whether that's a real increase in their ability to provide services.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Could that include grants as well?

Tom Stucky: I believe at that level it was all revenue streams.

Marilyn Pfisterer: OK.

Eric Wright: We can actually in the survey break down, did we do that in here?

Tom Stucky: We didn't do it in here. We actually have the percent of revenue but we didn't do it by increasing and decreasing. So table 2 shows you the revenue sources and where those are coming from but we didn't ask them where those were changing, so we don't know if grant income is declining at this level compared to other sources. We don't know changes in revenue streams.

Rhonda: Thanks, this is great. It's a great start.

Eric Wright: It is available on the website, right?

Lyndy Kouns: Right.

Eric Wright: Yes. So if you want to share this with others you can disseminate. We'll be doing a mailing to all the people that participated in the survey. And I think we may wait until we do the program report to do both at the same time. Or did we already mail the other one out?

Lyndy Kouns: We haven't mailed it yet. It's sitting, waiting for approval to go.

Eric Wright: OK. And our PR people who work at the Institute are interested in doing something flashy with this but before we do anything, like a press release, that kind of thing, I don't know if anybody would object to doing that. That's a question for you all. It might raise the ire of the issue. The other question would be to wait until we do the program level report so we have both pieces together, that was my initial inclination, which would put it probably in January.

Rhonda Allen: That makes the most sense to me. Because I think there's some questions that this generates that maybe the program level survey might answer, so combining them and then releasing them would probably be a good idea. Just my thought.

John Kennedy: Good idea.

Tom Stucky: And if you need the website, it's on the bottom of the first page.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Was the press and the promo generated to – what was the purpose of it other than to just getting information out. Usually there is an agenda, an underlying agenda. Is that to get more grant funding, to make more people aware?

Eric Wright: Well, from our point of view it's simply to share our good work. That's what our press people are supposed to do. I think actually from a larger institutional point of view, which will come up later when we talk about sustainability, the conversations I've been having with various folks, I think the more we can raise this issue in the public mind the better. Particularly now with the more challenging economic times we are facing but also to help citizens understand the priorities and the decisions we have to make about where we spend our money. So I think the more we keep it in the public's eye, the better. So my thought is depending on how we talk about sustainability we could time it so it precedes some other decision making. We could coordinate that with you or the City-County Council. We don't want to trump anybody, our new PR people like to put out press releases every time we put out a new report. And occasionally they get picked up by the news media. We do a lot more news interviews than we did last year.

Marilyn Pfisterer: That was the reason that generated my question, creating an awareness among those folks that might have grant money available.

Eric Wright: Right, and I think that might be very timely.

Rhonda Allen: Alright, do you want to move on, Eric?

Eric Wright: Sure.

Rhonda Allen: And which are you prepared to move towards? The EIPC ordinance or something else?

Eric Wright: I don't know. They all sort of lumped together, so I think we may jump around a little bit. If you may remember at the last meeting we talked about there was some agreement that, oh I should report on a couple meetings that have occurred in between the last meeting and this meeting. There have been a lot of discussions about trying to figure a way to fund the plan as it was originally proposed including some of the folks who are guests today as well as some other folks in the community with the philanthropic side of the system. There was pretty much a clarity that the city is not going to be able to come up with any money in the next year in terms of the hard budget, forgive me if I'm mischaracterizing that. The recommendation was to see if we can find grant funding to support parts of the program at least in short term with the idea of the long term with the City sort of working this into the normal budget. I can also now communicate that the philanthropic community has sort of embraced this idea but they are not necessarily worrying about, the grant money is not ready to come forward in terms to support the short term. They are really sticking to their guns if you will about the idea that the city needs to take on this public responsibility for the long term and they are sort of in a wait and see attitude. I have been told it should be a good idea if I went to talk to the Coalition for Human Services Planning, which I am not on their agenda yet but I am working on that, and I will present the plan and the whole discussion and that's the group where there's a bunch of funders at the table so who knows what will come out of that. I don't expect somebody to write a check as a result of the meeting for sure but I think the bottom line is that we should turn to Rebecca to find out what opportunities she was able to identify where the city or the, there was some discussion which I thought was really interesting in these conversations about should the applicant be the coordinating agency or should it be the City or County of Indianapolis/Marion County. That was actually one of the questions that the philanthropic groups were asking. There seems to be some

sense that they would prefer it to be the coordination agency as opposed to the City. I am not exactly sure why, but that seemed to, at least one funder specifically mentioned that. He was also tasked to think about it some more. I think there is some discussion that I think goes back to the EIPC organization, which is why these issues are intertwined with one another. I hope I haven't made everyone totally confused, but I think the basic sentiment is everybody seems to like the idea of going forward. If we could find some grant money to do parts of the plan then I think based on our prioritization that would be identifying the coordinating council who would serve as the umbrella organization. And then perhaps also do the management of the EIPC because that's another issue we have to think about sustainability over the next few years and then with the idea of working towards adding this to the budget for the city-county. Did I totally confuse you? I know I was bouncing around, but they're really intertwined. It's starting to get really hard to disentangle them. Everybody feels like they understand where we are?

Brant Ping: We have no money. I got that much.

Rhonda Allen: That's good Brant.

Eric Wright: So maybe we should start there, then, and ask Rebecca to say what she was able to find, if anything, on grant possibilities you had mentioned when we met.

Rebecca Swope: Well I think quickly, to answer your question about who should be the applicant, really based on the funding opportunity, the funder will be the one who decides because most funders will either only fund a non-profit or only fund a government agency. So I think we will really be limiting ourselves to what funds we can apply for by saying only the City will apply or only the coordinating agency will apply. It will probably end up being a combination of the two to get the kind of money that we're looking for. The first thing that jumped off the page for me as far as Federal funding would be the formal funding for Title 2 programs that comes from the Department of Justice through the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute. Those funding, let me make sure I get this right, that fund is going to be for youth programs usually between \$5,000 and \$150,000 a year running from October 1st through September 30th funding year. Their solicitation is usually due at the end of July so that would be something we would want to start to consider in the spring if we wanted to look for money there. The City has historically received funds usually in the \$60,000-\$70,000 a year range for a couple of projects. One is Restorative Justice which actually passes through to the Reach for Youth program and then the Probation Department receives some Title 2 funding as well. And I think the purpose of Title 2 is to be seed money for youth oriented criminal justice prevention and intervention kind of funds so I think that's right on the ball, it's not going to provide all the money that we'll need obviously, but as far as being able to work with ICJR before we submit an application so we know what they are really looking to fund and what we can realistically apply for, the City has a strong relationship with CJJ and I think that would, I don't want to say foolproof because nothing is foolproof, but I think that would be a very strong option for us as far as grant funding. From a nonprofit standpoint, I know that the budget includes mostly personnel dollars, and the City has been successful in the past receiving funds from the Indiana Youth Institute. It doesn't provide a lot of money but does provide professional development money that could be used once we get things rolling and once we have a staff on board. They provide up to \$750 for individual professional development or \$1,500 for staff training if we were to bring someone in. Whenever we have a pilot program like this it's good to bring everyone on board with the same kind of training. So that would be something to look into, the Indiana Youth Institute. They also provide some organizational grants up to

\$5,000 we could potentially look at once things get rolling. The last time a very small group of us met I talked about some foundations that would potentially be able to provide a little more money, they would need to fund the coordinating agency because they would fund a 501C3 nonprofit. Councillor Pfisterer, you asked for me to look into the Gates Foundation , we definitely have a pilot program here that would fit into the scope of what they would fund however at the moment they don't have any open opportunities. But that's something that we can continue to follow up with them. They have a full calendar of grant funds.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Thank you for looking.

Rebecca Swope: Absolutely. We have a lot of opportunities as far as grant funds and I don't expect to get all of our money in one spot but I think we have definitely some spaces we can look for at least partial funding. Any questions?

Marilyn Pfisterer: Not a question, but just to follow-up on what you said, I have contacted Dr. Boyd with the idea of approaching the State, House of Representatives and Senate, for money there and while I'm keeping my fingers crossed I have yet to get a response. So listening to the news lately I've been a little less positive about that approach because of the budget situation that the State is going to find themselves in. But, I am still expecting a response and will follow up again. I followed up once and will follow-up again.

Rebecca Swope: On the awards directly from the Federal Government, in this project area, tend to open up around this time of year and usually be due for submission the end of January beginning of February, and so we may see some more grants.gov open up. I feel like applying for Federal funding directly from the Feds, when we receive a reward it's usually a larger dollar amount that is much more substantial in what it can fund. It's kind of, throw it against the wall and see if it'll stick, because unlike when we apply for funding from a local entity, the State, the Criminal Justice Institute or a local foundation, where you can really go and speak to the funder and get an idea of what they want to look for and make sure that that relationship is there before you submit the application, when you submit to the Feds you are submitting to a panel of unknown reviewers. You can give it your best shot and hope for best. I feel like when you apply locally you really can get an idea of your chances before you even apply. So, of course I'll keep my eye open at grants.gov and see if there's something that opens up the next few weeks as a lot of opportunities have been posted since the first of the month and will continue to be throughout the next few weeks.

Rhonda Allen: To kind of confuse things a little bit more for you Eric, when you talk about EIPC and where it stands with the City and Coordinating Council, the other thing that overlaps with this is the Regional Services Council. There was legislation passed in July that makes the Regional Services Council, which I chair, obligated to developing an early intervention plan. It kind of parallels exactly what this group is doing as well. The reason I primarily mention this is that the child welfare service line item in the Family and Children budget has traditionally always been a line item that could be used for early intervention and prevention. That's the only line item in the budget that we could tap into to pay for prevention types of services. Like, we pay for Safe Sleeping, so we have a contract with Riley in which they provide cribs to families who are at risk. So things like that we are able to do, but that's the only line item out of a \$101 million budget that we could ever tap into for things like that. That money will continue even though that is shifting over to the state. So there is approximately a million dollars there

that we could, though obviously not all \$1 million could go to fund what we have suggested here but clearly I think there is an avenue for the State to chip in and pay for something.

Eric Wright: That's great news, in fact the best news I think we've heard so far today. It sounds to me like we have a window of opportunity. Rebecca has suggested that over the next 6 months or so there might be a number of grant opportunities to pursue this. Now the problem we run into from a sustainability point we are ending, the end of December, and so the question is how do we make it over the next 6 months to have the resources necessary to go after these grant proposals? I think that is the key question. So I guess one question would be, and at the last meeting we talked about pulling together the staff of this group with the coordinating agency activity and blending those initiatives. One question would be is, we'll come back to the role of the EIPC as a decision maker here in a minute, but if the Regional Service Planning Council, is that the right phrase?

Rhonda Allen: That's good enough, yes.

Eric Wright: Would they be willing to entertaining funding the coordinating council for a year?

Rhonda Allen: Well, I think so. Independent of the discussion here, I have been having discussions with folks who are on the Regional Services Council that really what we are planning here really fits with what we need to be doing with prevention with the child welfare service line item. And so it's on the agenda for my meeting on November 21st for the Regional Services Council. At that meeting we really need to start identifying where we want to spend that \$1 million for prevention and early intervention. So I think so, to answer your question, yes, I do think that makes the most sense to keep this going for 6-9 months to a year in order to look at those other grant opportunities. I'm going to mention it. It's up to the Regional Services Council to vote on it so that way you would have the ability to submit a proposal.

Eric Wright: So the step would be that they would vote to accept a proposal.

Rhonda Allen: Well, really accept the idea of utilizing what we've done with EIPC and the coordinating piece, accepting that and identifying an amount of money that we'd want to take out of that million dollar fund. So that's probably what they would have to vote on to make that final. And then, everything is just so complicated right now. The Child Welfare Service fund now, even though it's State, the State was trying to get all these providers under state contract. What was impossible was to get all the early intervention and prevention stuff under State contract, so it will be a sub contract through the Children's Bureau because they are our community partners program, NACS, so they're a natural entity to have that money so they'll be the ones actually receiving proposals after the Regional Services Council votes to accept that type of service under the Child Welfare Service funding, if that makes sense. It's kind of confusing.

Bob Cockrum: The regional group you are talking about, is that just Central Indiana or is that the whole state?

Rhonda Allen: No, it's Region 10, Marion County. We're our own region because it's so large and there's 18 regions throughout the state. And so this just services Marion County.

Bob Cockrum: So the million dollars is just for that region only?

Rhonda Allen: Yes, for Marion only, right.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Is there anything that you would need in terms of hard copy or personnel to help make that presentation?

Rhonda Allen: You know, Brant's on the Council, so I really figured between Brant and I, and Chris Ball is on the Council as well, and so I figured between the three of us we could do a pretty good job of educating the rest of the Council on what this is and what this could mean and really supporting. Actually it was Chris Ball who came up to me after one of the meetings and said I think the whole EIPC thing would really fit with this Child Welfare Service funding.

Jason Dudich: If the region is all of Marion County and this council is inevitably Marion County, are we duplicating it all, and I'm going way, way out on the reservation here, but are we duplicating it all with early intervention planning that's going on with region, with what's going on with this council? Is it now shifting that since it's now Marion County in the region and there's a \$1 million available, would that be a possible ongoing funding source for the agency and for the services or are they really two separate entities that can work together but really have two different goals and two different objectives?

Rhonda Allen: I think that's an excellent question actually. Since Marion County is so large, I've worked in smaller communities in this regional type of setting and so in smaller communities I think Regional Services Council and EIPC's service can merge and be one. Marion County is so large and Regional Services Council was really developed to monitor everything under DCS and Juvenile Probation. And so our treatment services, our intervention services, and then we've got that small area of prevention that we have to look at as well. That's too much for the Regional Services Council, so I think it's great that this looks at the early intervention piece and prevention piece because I think Eric, you guys have the resources to really look at that. And there's no way the Regional Services Council could ever duplicate the kind of research and support that you've provided. There is just no way. It would be left up to folks like Brant and I and Chris to do that and we don't have the time and I don't think I have the intelligence to do everything that you all did. So I see the benefit of actually having the two separate entities working together. Because I do think this has its only focus on early intervention and prevention. I guess I would say that it would be helpful to have you, Eric, come to Regional Services Council if indeed this is the direction that we go and the Council votes to do this to be an extension of that group. You wouldn't have to attend every time but maybe do what you do here, come in and give us information about what's going on and how we are proceeding.

Eric Wright: Okay, that's back to the sustainable because we are ending at the end of December. So the question we need to address is, if we're going to do the coordinating council, where we had gotten to at the last meeting was the coordinating agency, whoever that would be, would take over our role as well. That was my understanding. So it wouldn't necessarily be me, it would be that agencies appointee. That was my understanding. Now, I'm happy to be a consultant occasionally but unfortunately the resources of the University aren't so vast that I can stop teaching class and do this stuff all the time, which would be nice some days. So that's part of the sustainability plan, so if there is interest in keeping us involved for a period of time, I already volunteered to help with the grant writing over the next year because we have all

the stuff to pull together the data really easily on a volunteer basis but I think it's really important for the sustainability of the entire initiative to think about a model that's going to last for the longer term. It's not me specific, that's my only objection to that.

Jason Dudich: And on the funding side if we're going to have an ongoing coordinating agency, whether it be funded through the Regional Services Council or through a grant or through the City, I think you had mentioned Eric, a RFP that would be done to select a coordinating agency and that coordinating agency would kind of take the lead and would have the responsibility for "x" number of years under contract to coordinate and to run that part of it. So I don't think, in terms of timing, I don't know if this council would issue a RFP or if we would hold off and say we could find some funding to make this work for another year or nine months and then during that time develop a RFP for a coordinating agency, work on grant funding, and grant application. So I don't think we can hand it off to you again in January and say you're the person doing it unless the Council wants to do it that way. So I just wonder if the Council wants to do a RFP and actually bid this out or if it's a professional services contract that we can do, but it at least sounds like step one so we can identify somebody.

Eric Wright: Just as a friendly amendment, before we came up with the RFP idea the EIPC had discussed the idea of actually picking an agency to do this. I think a part of this is the ambiguity around what is the authority the EIPC has to do things, can we receive funds, all that kind of stuff. I think we had originally talked about a couple of agencies as being the appointees. And so another option besides doing the RFP would be for this body to appoint a group to function that role for a year or two. Of course the resources, I'm assuming, hopefully this Regional Service Planning Council will be amenable to the idea, will get us through that, but we wrote into the coordinating agency role grant writing. There is a development person built into that budget with the idea we could work with them on an informal basis to do that. I think the more infrastructure we can create in the short term for two reason, one is the philanthropic community would see that much more positively as a more permanent solution, particularly if we could do this with the idea that the Council would bring this to the City-County Council budget discussions right up front so at the same time we're funding this year we're also bringing this into the City-County budget for long term sustainability. And then I think two years from now I wouldn't be surprised if there's lots of support from the local philanthropic community.

Marilyn Pfisterer: One question I had, though, if the Regional Service Council is willing to fund it through this line item you mentioned, will they want to be involved in the decision as to who the coordinating agency would be?

Rhonda Allen: Well I think yes. I do think there would be representation from the Regional Services Council in with the Children's Bureau who is going to be brokering that money for us. I think the entities from Regional Services Council and Children's Bureau will come together and review potential applicants for this coordinating body or coordinating agency. I think it will go quicker than a traditional RFP in doing the whole competitive bidding piece because I think the way we're structured is that with the sub contract I just think it's going to be an easier process to get going. But again, I still need the Regional Services Council to agree that this is the direction they want to move.

Brant Ping: Rhonda, do we any constraints on use of the Child Welfare Fund? As far as restrictions I mean, it has to be entirely direct service dollars or anything like that?

Rhonda Allen: No, I have not seen anything like that. I will check again, but I have not seen any criteria that really limits what we can do with that money.

Brant Ping: Rebecca, you talk about we disadvantage ourselves to limiting right now to just one agency, either not for profit or governmental. Are you proposing that we have some type of public private partnership that each arm of that partnership will apply for those grants that they would be eligible for?

Rebecca Swope: That would really open us up to being able to apply for a wider span of grants. If we, for example, had the Department of Public Safety apply on behalf of the City for government funds and then the coordinating agency apply for private foundation funds. However, I'm not quite sure how that partnership would be structured or who the players would be but I think that that would really be advantageous from a fund raising standpoint to have those options.

Eric Wright: I guess I would agree. If we modularized the recommendation with that in the back of our mind, recognizing that different funders might want to buy different pieces of plans. I think that's a very reasonable stance because the case management service program might be something the government might really be willing to fund as opposed to the coordinating agency. It is akin to operating costs which most private funders don't like paying for operating costs. Don't ask me why, that's just their tradition. So I think doing this in a compartmentalized way might actually be a really good strategy, but the key is we need to sort of create the infrastructure that's going to be able to coordinate with the city and with the private, and write the grants over the long term. And for me that first goal is now sort of paramount and the question in the short term is how do we fund that so that basically over the next year the grant writing can occur to do all the other parts?

Brant Ping: Do we have a sense of how much we need to fund that infrastructure?

Eric Wright: Yes, if we combine Appendix A and B, it's about \$300-\$400 thousand which would include supporting for all the development officer, the web man for the database system we had talked about, the strategic planning person, plus then the staff support for us that we're providing now. That would sort of get us through a year. I think. Of course it may not even be that much because by the time we do this RFP process we may be in the third or the second quarter or something by the time we identify that person. But I'm, we are now at the point where I am getting worried about, we're going to have this gap and all the energy is going to fall out from underneath us and we are going to lose the momentum we've been building for the last few years.

John Brandon: If we're looking for a model for that joint partnership, we might want to look to what takes place between schools and nonprofit organizations that work in schools. Often times, schools as the local education agency can apply for dollars that are not available to a nonprofit and vice versa, they blend those dollars to do afterschool programming and tutoring and all those sorts of supportive services as well. So that may be a model to look to in terms of how that's structure, the partnerships between a local school district and a YMCA or somebody of that nature because that's fairly common.

Eric Wright: And I think we originally, when we first floated the idea, had actually identified McCoy as a potential candidate for doing, as a vehicle for doing this. So one possibility would sort of be to rethink

that, go back to that idea as opposed to the RFP model which might, my biased, if I have one, is to go with an existing organization so we're not having to create infrastructure off the bat because what we really need is somebody who can tool up fast, if you will, to be able to not miss the opportunity that Rebecca was eluding to with the federal grants which are going to come due here in the next two months. Those unfortunately never give you enough notice on those things. So you really have to be able to have a staff person on hand who can drop everything and work on those for two weeks. That's usually the timeline they give you unfortunately.

John Kennedy: I think that makes sense.

Rhonda Allen: I'm sorry, Marilyn had a question.

Marilyn Pfisterer: That's okay.

Rhonda Allen: You've been trying to get in.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Not stepping on toes. Going back to your Regional Services Planning Council you said it was November 21st, my question was, and no pressure here, would there be a decision made at that 21st, November 21st meeting or would it be the subject would be opened up and a discussion ongoing because we're looking at the December 31st ending with IUPUI.

Rhonda Allen: Okay. Well, I guess it just depends on the questions that are generated by the council. I would anticipate, we're a pretty efficient group wouldn't you say Brant?

Brant Ping: Yes.

Rhonda Allen: I would say that, I would say that we would have some pretty clear direction at the end of the 21st meeting on where we can go with this coordinating agency piece.

Eric Wright: So would that mean that we should pull together the pieces of the large document into a two-page proposal with a budget?

Brant Ping: Yes.

Rhonda Allen: That would be beautiful. Yes.

Eric Wright: So done.

Rhonda Allen: Okay, great.

Marilyn Pfisterer: And they would be amenable to having McCoy considered as the coordinating agency?

Rhonda Allen: Well, I think so, but I'm going to have to pose that to the group.

Brant Ping: My immediate concern is how unsure the surveyed agencies were about that, they said they needed a coordinating agency but they weren't too keen on getting an existing one designated.

John Brandon: Yes, they said they wanted one.

Rhonda Allen: You missed this piece I think Brant, you were taking a call, but on page 18 it kind of goes through the existing agencies that were mentioned.

Brant Ping: Ah, okay.

Eric Wright: And you should go back a little bit further, but you notice on page 17 at the top of the page, the question was an existing agency could coordinate the services, most people were neither agree or disagree and then the next question was a new organization should be created again, not sure was the majority response there. And so I think McCoy got the most mentions because I think everyone has thought about them organizationally as being in that role, there was only 14 people who actually responded with a specific suggestion so it's a minority of individuals, so I would say that the community of youth service providers would be agnostic on the issue frankly.

Laura Littlepage: Most people strongly agree or agree that there's advantages of having one it was just the opinion of whether it should be an existing one or new, they really didn't care. They think there should be one.

Rebecca Swope: From a funding perspective, I think it would be a lot more desirable to have an existing organization because there's a proven track record of their ability to carry out services and be effective. If I were a funder I would be a lot more likely to fund an existing organization so that would be my vote.

Brant Ping: There's some history.

John Kennedy: There's also a logic to the suggestion to use McCoy in that they convened all the providers in the county and got many people to create a strategic plan in 2005. I see this as the implementation of this plan. I think there's a natural fit there. So that's what makes sense to me. It's a logical progression I think as to where we need to go.

Bob Cockrum: The parks department has been very successful in getting federal grants for summer programs and that kind of stuff and it's expanded every year and whatever we spend we wind up getting approved from the federal government. So maybe if we can tap into that source, I don't know enough about it to really talk about it, but I know over the last few years we've done more and more every summer. The parks programs and feeding lunches and that kind of stuff and it's all been paid for by the federal government.

Eric Wright: Do you think that whatever sources they're getting money would be supportive of an infrastructure like this?

Bob Cockrum: I don't know.

Eric Wright: I suspect those are mostly program grants and service.

Jason Dudich: It's mostly program dollars that are a hundred percent federally reimbursed if it's for a specific population of individuals that have a certain income status. So I think Parks has to have an infrastructure it's just the actual dollars for the meals and any other services so it's a possibility but you could dovetail it possibly in with that kind of program but the infrastructure, I think the feds are just looking more programmatic than actual infrastructure on that.

Bob Cockrum: Well I know they look at each school in the district and the how many kids they've got in their lunch program and that kind of stuff. So that's the kind of community that they want us to serve.

Eric Wright: So it might be something that basically this new coordinating agency would work with the Parks Department to help coordinate not only what's going on there but what's going on on the nonprofit side. Again I think that underlines the need for such a group.

Jason Dudich: I guess to bring things around, is it the will of the council to ask the Regional Services Council to find funding to support Dr. Wright's group until a RFP is done for a coordinating agency? Is it to find funding for the coordinating agency sometime in 2009 and hopefully transition the next month and a half? I'm just trying to, because if it Regional Council money that's being used, I'm sorry it's the mechanics in me that makes me say this, but if it's Regional Services Council money that would be used to fund the coordinating agency, is it then a contract between the coordinating agency and the Regional Services Council, is it a grant from the Regional Services Council to the council that we can then go out and hire somebody? Is this more of a bridge funding to get Dr. Wright's group where we can start issuing a RFP and then have an actual coordinating agency available and is the council willing to fund that as well if we can't find anything within the city? I'm just trying to understand the mechanics of it if we go down that path. What's the, what are the steps if we go to the council, what are we actually asking for? Is it the long-term funding or just the short term funding for Dr. Wright's group? Or is it Dr. Wright's group and the coordinating agency for like a year or two?

Rhonda Allen: I think it's that. I think it's asking for Dr. Wright's group to continue and so some support funding for that and then the coordinating agency piece as well.

Jason Dudich: Okay.

Eric Wright: Well, that wasn't what I was thinking.

Rhonda Allen: Okay.

Jason Dudich: That's why I wanted to make sure we were clear on what we were asking for.

Eric Wright: Appendix A and B, the B part was basically the budget we estimated for continued support for the EIPC. Now, in our last meeting we gave you a combined budget which was probably a little bit lower than the number I threw out there a while ago. I just was doing the math in the back here, but that was based on the assumption that this coordinating agency would basically take over our responsibility in addition to doing the responsibilities that we had articulated. And I think, I would be reluctant, I mean we're happy to help along the way and we could do so perhaps at a lower level but I think my

recommendation would be to push this into the community as fast as possible because I think one thing first off if we're going to have the buy-in at the City-County Council next year in the budget process I suspect having demonstrated success of this coordinating agency in the short-term is going to be really a linchpin in making the case about this being important. I can also verify for a fact that the philanthropic organizations would see that as being linchpin in their coming to the table again. And I think having us along for the ride so to speak might be not the best use of the funds. My suspicion would be that we could provide, put the bulk of the funding into this agency to hire the grant writers to get them going so that they're moving the process along as fast as possible because we really do have this window of about a year to make something happen. Then I think if this is going to work, then this agency, whether it's McCoy or somebody else, that's a lot of pressure to be handing. I'd rather have all the resources targeted where they need to be targeted to make them as maximally successful.

Rhonda Allen: I agree.

Eric Wright: Not that I'm trying to throw the baby out with the bath water.

Rhonda Allen: I agree, but I think the bridge-gap measure though, I don't know how quickly we can get a coordinating agency up and going so you know I'd like to think by March maybe, but I mean still we have January and February that we need to get through as well. So if there's any way that you could fill that spot that gap that we have, that would be helpful until we get the coordinating agency piece.

Bob Cockrum: Would this come through your organization as a grant or would you issue a RFP?

Rhonda Allen: We wouldn't issue a RFP. Since that money technically is going to be brokered through the Children's Bureau, the Regional Services Council would just make the decision about how we want to use our money. The Children's Bureau would take over from there contacting the agency that we recommended and then going through the proposal.

Bob Cockrum: So we're talking 60 to 90 days before we actually have some contractual advancement.

Rhonda Allen: I would guess yes, which is pretty quick I think.

Eric Wright: Certainly compared to the state.

John Kennedy: So in that 60 to 90 days, I think you're asking that Eric's group continue working on this?

Rhonda Allen: On some sort of lower level is what I'm hearing. Maybe not to the same degree that you have with everything else that you've done but a lower level involvement until we can get the coordinating agency up and going.

John Kennedy: I'm hearing you say and these are my words, that perhaps the role, a role definition is in order there where they might coach this along so that it's just not that they pull out one day and the next day the coordinating agency is suppose to be in operation.

Eric Wright: A transition period

John Kennedy: Right, so there's got to be some transition. A plan. So you're asking Eric to stay on to be a part of that transition plan. Is that correct?

Rhonda Allen: I think that was part of the original idea to begin with, right?

Eric Wright: That was our goal originally, yes.

John Kennedy: And you're not surprised by that or surprised by that?

Eric Wright: Well no, we had this conversation last year thinking this year would be the transition year.

John Kennedy: You started to draw a line in the sand.

Eric Wright: But I think actually if we move that, we can certainly work that into the budget at a pretty minimal cost I would hope. I think the question would be how much grant writing time, in the short time, would we require? Depends on how many grants we go after. So, I think a lot of the writing is already done so it's going to mainly cut and pasting and putting things together making sure we're doing the right grant proposal requirement things, but if you're helping too then we can sort of do this as a training period. Think of it as a training period. And I would probably actually argue that we should do this for a six month period as opposed to making it a three month. Sort of a winding down kind of a model, but the goal would be that we would be out of this by June.

Marilyn Pfisterer: So that \$300-400 thousand dollar amount would cover both ends. It would cover the coordinating agency and having your group involved?

Eric Wright: Yes, because basically what I would propose is that about \$100 thousand of that budget was to do the function for this group and so what I would do is probably budgetarily say we're going to split that with us and the coordinating council with the idea that we'll take the first six months and they'll get the latter six months of that or some sort of formula there to sort of wean them off. My concern is that in order for us to be able to respond to these grant proposal, I have to be able to pay Laura and a bunch of other people to be responsive. So I mean I will actually contribute my time. That's actually the most expensive piece of the budget. But I think, we have to sort of figure how to do the staff support. If you guys are comfortable with that, I'm comfortable with that. So the question then is do we want to go ahead and say McCoy because the sooner we make that decision, or we're going to do a RFP? I think we should make those the two choices, because frankly from a training point of view I'd rather say we can start working with McCoy because actually all the data that we are going to handoff would go to whoever this agency is going to be so there is a lot of stuff that would need to transpire. If that's the proposal, I'll write it as such.

John Kennedy: I don't think we can get this up and running through a RFP process as fast as the other choice of using an existing infrastructure.

Rhonda Allen: Did you have a question Brant?

Brant Ping: I just, I thought Children's Bureau was under the impression they had to issue RFP's.

Rhonda Allen: I don't believe they do. I do believe they have to receive a proposal and they have to score it.

Brant Ping: How can they score it if they haven't issued the criteria by which they are going to score it?

Rhonda Allen: Well, they will develop service standards.

Brant Ping: Oh, okay.

Rhonda Allen: Yes, that's part of this really quick way of the State getting prevention and early intervention services state contracts.

Jason Dudich: So, who would McCoy be contracting with?

Brant Ping: Children's Bureau, or actually as a state community partner.

Rhonda Allen: Children's Bureau.

Jason Dudich: So McCoy, providing it be the coordinating agency for this group would actually be contracted with the Children's Bureau not a quasi-State entity but a State, not a City or a County agency, so not like Probation, not Juvenile, not the Courts, it would be more of a contract with the State in essence to provide those coordinating services?

Brant Ping: Right

Jason Dudich: So the requirements would fall into the State as to how the State chooses, whether it be McCoy or somebody else it would be the State regulations for procurement, not the City or the County's.

Brant Ping: I would think so. Yes. Although, one meeting I was at I got the impression that the entire thing was structured this way to give that kind of flexibility to this Child Welfare Fund. That it is less burdensome than the ordinary State issued request for proposal and scoring process that has been ongoing this year.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Jason, do you think that would make it more difficult, having it be a State agency that's more or less calling the shots to get it through the budget process in the future for the City?

Jason Dudich: I think it depends on what you're funding. If the City, if you're trying to find seed money to get the coordinating agency started and to possibly develop case management, if the State in essence is willing to take on some of that responsibility, then the question that the City and County would say is well should we also be funding a part of it? Is the State willing to fund the cost of early intervention coordinating services, and the cost case management services to push forward? Is it a joint effort where the State pays the coordinating agency cost but the City pays case management costs in future years? That's a possibility. As Eric and Rebecca said, there's a multitude of possible funding opportunities.

Whether it be grants coming in through the County or the City and then going to pay for case management and the State pays for the coordinating agency or the State pays a year of the coordinating agency and then we try to fit it in with the budget. I think there's different opportunities, or different ways that we could make that happen. I don't think it precludes anything being in the budget, it just may make the argument a little more difficult if the State's willing to pay for the coordinating agency, from my perspective, I would say well if they're willing to pay then are they willing to continue to pay for that ongoing? And then that would be up to the Regional Services Council to make that decision. I think if you put the funding mechanism in someone else's hands with all due respect, they can control whether or not they want to continue that if certain things come up. If it's in our hands, then we have a little bit more of an ability to determine if we do or do not want to continue those services.

John Kennedy: Wouldn't those questions be answered over this transition year?

Jason Dudich: I think they could, it's just the question if the Regional Services Council wants to continue funding the coordinating agency. If there's not a guarantee, but an understanding that for several years the City does not have this in the '09 budget, it would have to be negotiated as a part of the 2010 budget and depending upon how that goes, is the Regional Services Council willing to continue to fund that if funding is not made available or grant funding isn't identified. But, what I don't want to do is back this council into a position where a year later, the Regional Services Council has other priorities and then you lose that funding and it's not in the 2010 budget and now we've lost funding to fund McCoy or Eric's group and now we don't have any grant writers to apply for grants. So I just, what I don't want to do is put us in a position where we put the Regional Services Council in a tough position to make a call because we're asking them okay it's another year, are you going to fund us? And at the same time I don't want to put the infrastructure in jeopardy by saying if they control it, with all due respect, if you control it then it's really not under, I don't even know if it's under this council's control. I mean it's really under the control of the Regional Services Council. If I answered that, I may have gotten way off on a tangent and I apologize.

Eric Wright: I think what you're hitting on is actually essentially why the EIPC ordinance is back in front of you today because what it comes down to is who has authority. All along we have been talking about the city sort of stepping up and sort of institutionalizing something for the long haul. And so the question would be is taking the money from the Regional Services Planning, basically handing the authority over to the State. And I think one way around that would be is if we frame the proposal as a short term startup cost. And we can do it in a stepwise fashion and say we'll ask for full funding this year, half funding for the second year with the assumption that the City-County Council will be transitioning the funding there. I don't know how far they want to think ahead. It's just a thought, or make the proposal specifically say that this is for one year and one year only. And then basically the assumption is that we would have a year to get it into the City-County budget at some point. Because I think the question would be is then where's authority of the EIPC? And that's why in the in-between meetings we had we talked about we need to rethink the EIPC because the nature of the authority of the EIPC as a body is not clearly stated in the ordinance. So I think the question would be is from a long-term management point of view, what's the authority? What do we want the EIPC to do in a sense of a management role on behalf of the City-County? That's the core question because right now that is not clearly specified. It's kind of, the way the ordinance is written, maybe this is a gross oversimplification, but it was written kind of like a study committee as opposed to a management committee. Now that we have done the study, we're really trying

to move the system, I think we can say, at least it would be my recommendation that the ordinance be rewritten in such a way that the EIPC basically acts on behalf of the City and the County as a manager of the early intervention system, which primarily means oversight of the coordinating body and their work and then working with them to help bring in other grant funds.

John Brandon: And I would suggest that that is a key concept, is authority. Because one of the things that McCoy struggles, because we're an independent not-for-profit, and so our authority to bring people together to do things really comes down to a moral authority. It's an invitational sort of process and sometimes invitational doesn't get it done. So sometimes that has been a real struggle. So when we give the strategic planning process from the Marion County Child Welfare System, there was a perceived authority in that process because the Juvenile Courts, because the Department of Child Services endorsed the process people came to the table and people were willing to play in the sandbox because there was an authority behind it. So I, whether we're the coordinating agency or anybody's the coordinating agency, that is a critical piece, is the authority that is invested in the work that that group is doing because that will go a long way to make things happen and if that's not there it will struggle. I can just tell you that that's the thing that makes me pull my hair out at times. That's something that is the major struggle. Yes, I can get 25 youth serving agency executives in a room together, I did it yesterday, but to get them to work together because we don't give any money away it's really more of a suggestive almost trying to push folks along that line. So you hit, I think, Eric on a critically important topic, is this whole authority that's invested in this whole process. If that's not present it'll flounder.

Eric Wright: Well, I think there's two levels of authority we have to be clear about. One, is how does the EIPC, vis-a-vis the City and the County, that's one level of authority. Then, there's the other level of authority to what extent you have control if McCoy's the coordinating agency over the non-profits. And I think we should be realistic, legally you're never going to, it's going to be herding cats. So the question would be, I think the way we designed it in mind was by adding the development person, by adding a strategic planner that this would add resources to an organization to be more aggressive than you have been able to do given your resources up to now. And also the development also becomes a carrot because if you start writing grants to three or four agencies, all you have to do is be successful at one of those to get three or four cats coming to the milk bowl, so to speak. So I think the idea is that we're going to move this system even though it's an informal moving of the system but the idea is that we're investing in the organization but the question would be is the EIPC having oversight of the coordinating agency. So they have the power then to excuse us, I don't think it would happen, but fire McCoy if they're the identified and find somebody else to do the job if they're not doing it and hold them to standards and accountability, having goals about what are we going to bring in next year in terms of grant dollars, what are we going to do in terms of moving the system in terms of outcome, all those kinds of things. So the EIPC setting the bench marks for success and then being accountable and monitoring what's going on there. I think that actually would do two things. One, it'll relieve the, I think the EIPC could move to quarterly meetings in that oversight if we really do have that functioning agency doing a lot of the work that we've been doing behind the scenes so to speak.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Not to be catty, but did you have some language to change the ordinance? Did you have something clearly in mind to change the ordinance to?

Eric Wright: I didn't actually, this is Jason's idea.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Oh.

John Brandon: It's a great idea Jason.

Eric Wright: I'm not a lawyer, so I'd be the last person to do this.

Jason Dudich: I think when we met kind of as a smaller group John Cochran was there and I think that John had said he would take a look at it and I don't think knowing John's full plate that this has risen to the level of some other things, but I think that in reviewing it just very quickly at the last meeting a while ago, very quickly there's something in here about funding. It says that funding for the EIPC shall come from the Family and Children's Fund. As Rhonda and I both know, that fund is skimming down to the bare bones right now. We're trying to land the plane at zero. So a lot of it is the funding. I think as Eric said, the authority, if there is going to be some contractual agreement between the Regional Services Council and the coordinating agency, is this really just kind of a governing board that those entities come and report to us about how things are going? And there is a section here about designation of an existing organization as the team, it's a little vague, it says as that the council can designate someone. But it's very vague as who they can designate responsibilities to and authority to, so not reading it entirely I think that in terms of the infrastructure and what we want to do it really needs to either be one, totally rewritten based on what this council wants or going in systematically and saying I don't like that section, let's amend it here or I don't like that section, let's amend it. So I guess if we want to go in and totally rewrite this based on the game plan that we're building today that might take a little bit more time or if it's just reading through this and at the next meeting just kind of crossing things out and bringing up suggestions and maybe offering it up as an ordinance at the next council meeting, that could be an option. But there's a lot of stuff in here I think that's very valuable especially the mission as well as the programs being considered. For example the initial plan says that the council has to submit an initial plan before July 1 of each year. I don't know if this council has done that, and it really sets the responsibility for this entity to report to the judges what that plan is and I don't know if that's been done and if it needs to be done or if it's whatever. I'm open to whatever, again I'm not an attorney and I've tried to write legislation and the attorneys have basically ripped it apart saying you don't know how to write legislation.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Well I think that the genesis for the reporting before July 1st was the assumption that the City was going to fund it. And so, no the short answer is no that report has not been made, but I wondered about involving the Council, the City-County Council, Mr. Elrod. Perhaps it is something that could be expedited if we got him involved.

Jason Dudich: Yes, and I think he is very familiar with everything. I think he'd just need the ground work to say okay, what are the main components that you want to see either changed or a whole new ordinance. So I would probably defer to him and Mr. Cochran but just reading it I think it's a good foundation but I don't think it's good for what we're doing right now and what we plan on doing in the future. So I mean I am happy to look through it and mark out stuff and raise questions but how that's worded and the verbiage and if this council wants to approve that before it goes to the full City-County Council for review. I don't have a problem with that.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Would you be willing to sit down with us and Mr. Elrod and kind of hammer that out?

Jason Dudich: Yes.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Okay, I will see what I can do about arranging that.

Bob Cockrum: I would suggest that everybody has a copy of that ordinance to take a look at it before the next meeting to make any suggestions.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Or if we are going to meet again beforehand and bring it back, this is an ambitious project, but bring it back as a document to be approved, could those suggestions be emailed to me or to, I mean I'm willing to take that on?

Eric Wright: I mean we can bring that to the meeting to, that would be fine.

Laura Littlepage: Did we want to consider adding someone to the council from this?

Eric Wright: That was actually where I was going to go. This new discussion of Regional Services Council made me wonder if we shouldn't extend the membership to include somebody from that? A formal liaison to that group just for the long-term. Brant could actually do it really well, he's always here. He's always at the other one, I'm sure too.

Brant Ping: I'd be happy to.

Jason Dudich: I think we talked about the membership and for example there's no one here from the Mayor's office, but there is an appointee that as I stated to Counselor Pfisterer I'm not sure if I'm considered to be a experienced or trained person to public accounting but happy to fill that role but if you had someone from the Controller's office or the Mayor's office or other entities, I think the membership could probably change substantially in terms of who we want at the table and their roles and activities. So I think that's another area we probably need to look at as well.

Rhonda Allen: I think as long as you have Director of the Department of Child Services as an appointee here, that's the natural person that is always going to be the Chair and appointed to Regional Services Council so I kind of see that person filling that liaison role, if that makes sense?

Eric Wright: Okay.

Jason Dudich: You could probably write something in there, if the DCS representative is not on the Regional Services Council a member can be appointed that is from the Regional Services Council as well based on the status and whether or not the DCS Director is on there or not.

Bob Cockrum: As their designee.

John Brandon: So is the suggestion then that we all review the current ordinance and send any comments and suggestions to Marilyn by – give us a date, Marilyn.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Well, when's the next meeting?

Rhonda Allen: December 12th.

Eric Wright: Remember, you've got Thanksgiving in there.

Marilyn Pfisterer: So if I say December 5th, it gives us a deadline of a week before the meeting to coordinate it all.

Jason Dudich: Did you say December 12th?

Marilyn Pfisterer: December 12th is the next meeting.

Jason Dudich: On a Friday? Do we normally have them on Wednesday?

Eric Wright: Wednesday. Whatever the second Wednesday is.

Jason Dudich: It's the 10th.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Okay, how about making the deadline December 3rd? And that gives us a week.

Eric Wright: And we will then draft a proposal, basically a one to two pager, we'll just cut and paste out of the plan and then add the budget with an assumption of our role diminishing over the first six months of '09 with the idea of helping with the transition process. And then, just to be clear we are going to specify McCoy as the designee?

Rhonda Allen: You know, I've been thinking about that. Here is what I'm most comfortable with in going to the Regional Services Council, is supplying them with this information from the survey about who has been mentioned. It makes sense to allow them to make that decision, whether we just limit it to McCoy or whether we choose the top two, kind of a mini RPF process between the two. But I would like to leave that up to the Council if you don't mind. But I will give them this information from the survey.

Eric Wright: Now while these other organizations were mentioned, aside from McCoy being here, we have no idea if these other agencies would be interested at all in doing this job. But we certainly can provide copies of this. How many are on that group?

Rhonda Allen: There should be, if everybody shows up, there should be 12.

Eric Wright: 12, okay. So we'll write proposal as if identifying an organization in a generic sense and then we'll make reference to this report, something to that effect. I'll run it by you a couple of times before we get to the 21st. I'll circulate it as well to you all but it's basically going to be Appendix A, the text for Appendix A, and then we'll just talk about the budget in a different way, we'll keep them separate. What the cost of the coordinating agency would be, and the cost of supporting EIPC management process is, designating that we will be the grantee for the first half of the year and the new coordinating agency will pick up the rest of the year.

Rhonda Allen: Okay.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Consider this the obsessive me, but is it possible to get notification after the 21st to see what the Regional Services Council decides, if anything?

Rhonda Allen: Yes, absolutely. I can give that information to Laura and she can submit that to everybody.

Marilyn Pfisterer: That way by the time we get here on the 10th we'll kind of know where the land lays. Thank you.

Rhonda Allen: Sure.

Jason Dudich: And are you going to make a decision at that meeting as to who the agency will be?

Rhonda Allen: That is my hope. I'm going to push that through hard.

Jason Dudich: So by that meeting you'll decide whether or not they're going to fund the first half for Eric's group and then what entity will be the second half funding as the coordinating agency.

Rhonda Allen: Yes.

Eric Wright: And did you want me to be there or do you want to shepherd the proposal? Either way is fine with me.

Rhonda Allen: You know what, it would be helpful if you could at least be there. There might be some questions that come up.

Eric Wright: Okay, what time?

Rhonda Allen: 9:00 am.

Eric Wright: Alright.

Rhonda Allen: It's better than 8:00 am.

Eric Wright: It's not that, I have another standing meeting the 3rd Friday of every month. Well, I think we've covered the agenda.

Rhonda Allen: Okay, no other business?

John Kennedy: I move we adjourn.

Rhonda Allen: Oh, did you have something to hand out?

John Brandon: I don't know if folks are aware of this but I happened to bring copies of this. The Indiana Commission on Disproportionality in Youth Services which was a legislated mandated study commission to look at disproportionality, the issue of disproportionality in youth services in Juvenile Justice, Child Welfare, Education and Mental Health. And they issued their report. They have been operating throughout the last year gathering data, conducting listening processes across the state, focus groups and etc. They have just issued their report in the middle of October I believe it was and these are the recommendations that came out of report. The report itself is 88 pages of text and I happened to be at another meeting Saturday where one of our State Legislators had, I don't know if someone on his staff but had done this, but had actually compiled the recommendations into a listing, this grid format which I found extremely helpful because I've been trying to plow my way through that report. This makes it a little easier to look at and grasp exactly what the report is recommending. So I just pass that out as an informational sort of piece.

Rhonda Allen: Okay, great. Thank you. Anything else or other business? We're adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 am.